

Tactics In the Chess Opening 1

NEW IN CHESS

A.C. van der Tak &Friso Nijboer



Tactics In the Chess Opening 1

A.C. van der Tak &Friso Nijboer

SICILIAN Defence

NEW IN CHESS

© 2003 Interchess BV Published by New In Chess, Alkmaar, The Netherlands www.newinchess.com

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission from the publisher.

Cover design and drawing: Joppe Andriessen

Printing: A-D Druk BV, Zeist, The Netherlands Production: Anton Schermer Translation: Piet Verhagen Printed in the Netherlands

ISBN 90-5691-112-0

Tactics in the Chess Opening

In six volumes our series *Tactics in the Chess Opening* covers the entire range of openings from a tactical point of view.

Each volume has 250 fully annotated games, arranged by NICKEY, the opening classification system of New In Chess.

Sicilian Defence

In this book you will find carefully selected and expertly annotated Sicilian games full of unexpected turns and brilliant surprise attacks. You can study these games or just enjoy them, but either way they will end up making you a stronger player!

1. Sicilian Defence	1.e4 c5
2. Open Games	1.e4 e5
3. Semi-open Games	1.e4 rest
4. Queen's Gambit	1.d4 d5
5. Indian Openings	1d4 ∕∆f6
6. Flank Openings and Gambits	1.c4, 1.⊕f3 etc.

Contents

Najdorf Variation Black plays 2d6 and 5a6	9
Oragon Variation Black plays 2d6 and 5g6	44
Scheveningen Variation Black plays 2d6 and 5e6	72
Sozin and Velimirovic Variations Black plays 2 ②c6 and 5d6, White plays 6. ③c4	98
Rauzer Variation Black plays 2 2c6 and 5d6, White plays 6. 2g5	113
Sveshnikov Variation Black plays 2 2c6 and 5e5	129
Taimanov and Paulsen Systems Black plays 2e6 without 4�f6	143
Four Knights and Pin Variation Black plays 2e6 and 4 £16	160

Accelerated Fianchetto With 2 €c6 and 4g6	174
Rossolimo Variation The Anti-Sicilian with 3.\&b5	186
Alapin Variation The Anti-Sicilian with 2.c3	192
Various Systems	201
NICKEY Sicilian Defence	232
Index of Players	234
NIC - an Integrated System	238

Najdorf Variation

Black plays 2...d6 and 5...a6

SI 4.6

☐ Arencibia

■ Martin del Campo

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 a6 6.@g5 e6 7.f4 @c6!?

A provocative move for which there is no known refutation.
8. ♠ xc6

8.65 at once is another attempt to prove that Black's previous move is no good, but after 8...h6 9.2h4 @xx44 | 10.8x44 | (10.xx67) looks like a refutation but isn't: 10...\(\text{Loc}\) [15.\(\text{Loc}\)] 11.\(\text{Loc}\) 27.\(\text{Loc}\) 28.\(\text{Loc}\) 28.\(\text{Loc}\) 28.\(\text{Loc}\) 28.\(\text{Loc}\) 28.\(\text{Loc}\) 28.\(\text{Loc}\) 28.\(\text{Loc}\) 28.\(\text{Loc}\) 28.\(\text{Loc}\) 38.\(\text{Loc}\) 38.\

8...bxc6 9.e5 h6 10.\(\hat{\text{a}}\)h4 g5 11.fxg5
11.exf6 gxh4 is good for Black, as is 11.\(\hat{\text{a}}\)g3
\(\delta\)d5 12.\(\text{a}\)xd5 cxd5.

11... 2d5 12. 2e4

After 12.@xd5 cxd5 13.豐h5 豐b6! Black has good counterplay, e.g. 14.g6 豐b4+ 15.堂d1 豐xb2 16.gxf7+ 堂d7 17.覃c1 dxe5.

12... Wb6 13. 2d3 hxg5 14. 2f2

An example with 14.223 is 14...0f4 15.2xf4 gxf4 16.0xd6+ 2xd6 17.exd6 wxb2 18.0-0 wd4+ 19.2xh1 wxd6, with good play for Black, Gongora-Abreu, Cuban championship 2001.

14...訾xb2



15.0-0

15. ②xd6+ âxd6 16.exd6 黉e5+ or 15.exd6 f5 is good for Black.

15...₩xe5 16.âg3 ₩d4+

Worth considering is 16... € f4!?, a suggestion from the English grandmaster Tony Kosten.

17. ⊕h1 f5!

A. Vitolinsh-Drillinsh, Riga 1990.

18.c3 @xc3 19.@xc3 \mathbb{\mathbb{W}\text{xc3} 20.\pic1

After 20... g7 21. xc6 f4 22. c2! White has good compensation, Müller-Dinstuhl, German Bundesliga 1997.

21. Exc6 ⊕ b7

Another possibility is 21... £e7, whereupon White plays 22, we2, e.g. 22... \$17 23. \$161 f4 24.單c7 響e5 25.費c2 fxg3 26.罩fl+ 安g8 27. Qh7+ Ixh7 28. Wg6+ Ig7 29. We8+ Wh7 30 費h5+ dog8, and a draw through perpetual check according to Kosten.

22. #b3! axc6 23. *xe6+ ad8 24. Ixf5 24 Wf6+ is not convincing 24 0e7 25. 要xh8+ 会d7 26. 費h5 罩f8.

24...₩c3



24...賣a3 is met by 25.ac1! a5 26.af7 賣xd3 27 Wf6+ does 28 We6+ dods 29 Wf6+ and perpetual check.

25. 9 e1?

White should have gone for the draw: 25. Ixf8+ Ixf8 26. 要xd6+ 空e8 27. 對e6+. and pernetual check; 27.2.g6+?! is weaker: 27...算f7 28.費e6+ 含d8 29.axf7 費cl+ 30 @el 2b8 31. Wd6+ &c8 32. @e6+ &b7. White may well have thought that the text would lead to a quick win: if \mathbb{W}c3 retreats. 26 @ a5+ is fatal

25 @ d7!

Here White must have kicked himself! 26.\e2?

A last resort would have been 26, #xd7+ \$xd7 27. êxc3, but this would also have been very good for Black. 26...₩a1

Now &e1 is pinned as well! 27.₩f1 â a7

Covering Wal and rendering 28.2a5 harm-

28.IIf7 We5 29.h3 @c6 30.@f5 IIf8 31, 1xf8+ @xf8 32. @g4 @g7 33. @d2 **≣h**8

White resigned.

SI 5.2

☐ Murev ■ Vudasin

Podolsk 1991

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 a6 6.@g5 e6 7.f4 ₩c7 8.₩f3 h5 9 f5!?

Other possibilities are 9.2xf6 gxf6 10.e5 2b7 11. Wh5 and 9.0-0-0 b4 10.e5 2b7 11 @cb5 with very complicated play in both

9 h4

9... 2c6 10. 2xc6 ₩xc6 11. 2xf6 gxf6 12. Ad3 gives White a good position. 10.4 cb5!



The point of 9.f5!?, No good is 10.fxe6? bxc3 11. axf6 exb2 12. abl gxf6 13. 實xf6 實c3+

14 由f2 fxe6 15 微xh8 ac6, and Black wins. 10...axb5

A better alternative may be 10... \$\varphi\$b7!?; after 11.fxe6 fxe6, 12.@xf6 gxf6 13.\\xi\xf6 \xi\xe4+ 14.金位 響e5 15.全c7+ gd7 16.響xe5 dxe5 17.@xa8 &c5 is very good for Black. Ernst-Ungureanu, Berlin 1988, but 12.e5 ₩xf3 13 Øc7+ (13 exf3 axb5 14.exf6 \$\psi(7)\$ is unclear) 13 sbd7 14 @xf3 sbxc7 15 exf6 gxf6 16. \$xf6 \$\mathbb{I}g8\$ results in a roughly equal position

11 fye6!?

The alternative 11.@xh5+ leads to unclear play: 11 - Qd7 12 fxe6 Qxb5 13 公xb5 實c5. e.g. 14.@xf6 #xb5 15.@xg7 @xg7

11...@e7!?

Less good is 11...fxe6?! 12.@xf6 gxf6 13. #xf6, with good prospects for White. 12.e5 dxe5

After 12....&b7? White had prepared the surprising refutation 13.2xb5+ &f8 (13... &d8 14 exd60 14 exf61 @xf6 15 @xf61 @xf3 16 e7+

13. @xf6!



After 13.@xb5+?! \$\psi f8 14.@xf6 Black can recapture on f6 with the bishop, after which White has insufficient compensation for the sacrificed piece. 13. 2xb5?! #b7! looks good for Black as well

13...axf6!?

13... xf6?! would have been good for White: 14 @xb5! @c6 15 @xc6+ @xc6 16 @c7+ \$e7.17 @xa8 @d4.18.0-0-0.

14 @ xh5+ dof8 15 @ f5 @ xe6

In the game Murey-Spraggett, Paris 1991, Black played 15...fxe6?! here: after 16.6 xe7 sbxe7 17 響xa8 響h6 18.響a4 響d4 19.a3 (19 \(\frac{14}{2} \) should be good as well) 19. \(\frac{2}{2} \) d7. 20 gxd7! 響e3+21 drf1 響f4+22 dre2 響e4+ 23 sbd1 would have been good for White

16 @ ve7 8a5! 17 Wyf6 8yh5 18 8f1

18. de8 19. gxh8+ dxe7 20. gxh7 would have led to an unclear position with slightly better chances for White. Now the tension dissolves in a peaceful perpetual check.

19.要xe6 要e4+ 20.全d2 要d4+ 21.全e2 ₩xb2+ 22.de3 ₩c3+ 23.de2 ₩c2+ 24. ce1 @e4+ 25. cd2 @d4+

Draw

SI 6.2

☐ Van der Wiel ■ Kasparov

Amsterdam 1991

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 @f6 5.@c3 a6 6.@g5 e6 7.f4 @c7 8.@f3 Øbd7 9.0-0-0 b5 10.e5 ŵb7 11.₩h3 dxe5 12.0 xe6 fxe6 13. # xe6+ @e7 14. £xf6!? qxf6

Bad is 14... 2xf6? in view of 15. 2xb5+, e.g. 15... 全f8 16.fxe5 总c8 17. 變c6, with a winning position for White.

15. a e2

Threatening 16. &h5+. In the game Tseitlin-Gutman Soviet Union 1971 White tried 15 @xh5!? axh5 16 @xh5: after 16 ₩c6 17 Ød6+ ₩xd6 18 Txd6 Øc5 an unclear position arose.

11

15...h5 16.4 d5

The moves 16.£/3 and 16.£\25.5 fail to lead to an advantage (as well). An example with 16.f\(\text{ke}\) is Kuindzhi-Tseitlin, Soviet Union 1971: 16..£\(\text{ke}\) is 7.\(\text{kg}\) is 3\(\text{d}\) is 18.\(\text{ke}\) is 8\(\text{ke}\) is 4\(\text{ke}\) is 2\(\text{d}\) is 18.\(\text{ke}\) is 8\(\text{ke}\) is 2\(\text{ke}\) is 3\(\text{ke}\) is 2\(\text{ke}\) is 2\(\text{ke}\) is 3\(\text{ke}\) is 2\(\text{ke}\) is 3\(\text{ke}\) is 3\(\text{ke}\) is 2\(\text{ke}\) is 3\(\text{ke}\) is 3\(

16.... xd5 17. Xxd5 ⊕c5

After 17...②b6 White also holds the draw: 18.愈xh5+ (18.愈d3?! and 18.萬d3?! do not convince) 18...萬xh5 19.豐g8+愈f8 20.豐e6+, Capelan-Polugaevsky, Solingen 1974.

18. 學f5 學c6 19. 學g6+ 本f8 20. 耳hd1 After 20. 耳xe5?! Kasparov has indicated 20. 耳c8! as the strongest reply.

20...₩e8
After 20...@e6 21.@xh5 \(\beta\)xh5 \(\beta\)xh5

①xf4 23.豐h8+ 由f7 24.豐h7+ 由f8 25.豐h8+ it is also perpetual check. 21.豐f5 豐c8

22. #g6 #e6 23. axh5 #g8



24.Id8+

24... Exd8

Here the players agreed a draw in view of 25.\(\bar{2}xd8 + \hat{o}xd8 \) 26.\(\bar{e}e8 + \hat{o}g7 \) 27.\(\bar{e}g6 + \hat{o}f8 \) 28.\(\bar{e}e8 + \hat{o}f + \hat{o}f

SI 6.2

☐ Vitolinsh

■ Yuferov

Moscow 1972

1.e4 c5 2.②f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.②xd4 ②f6 5.②c3 a6 6.ଛg5 e6 7.f4 △bd7 8.₩f3 ₩c7 9.0-0-0 b5 10.e5

As we will see, this advance leads to extreme-

ly interesting complications.

10....\(\rightarrow\) b7 11.\(\psi\) h3 dxe5 12.\(\rightarrow\) xe6!? fxe6

13 \(\psi\) xe6.\(\rightarrow\) e7 14 \(\rightarrow\) xb5!?

For the alternative 14.£xf6!?, see Van der Wiel-Kasparov. A third possibility is 14.€xb5!? axb5 15.£xb5. In Kamsky-Gelfand, Linares 1993, Black had few problems

after 15...全e4! 16.量d2 空形. 14...axb5 15.②xb5 豐c6 16.②d6+ 空d8 17.fxe5 空c7

After 17... Ze8 18.exf6 gxf6 19. \(\Delta \text{the T} \) + \(\Delta \text{c7}! \) 20. \(\Delta \text{d7} + \text{ \text{wc8}} \) 22. \(\Delta \text{wd7} + \text{ \text{dc8}} \) 22. \(\Delta \text{wd7} + \text{ \text{dc8}} \) 23. \(\Delta \text{d1} + \text{ \text{dc8}} \) 62. \(\Delta \text{vd7} + \text{ \text{dc8}} \) 168. \(\Delta \text{c6} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{vc7} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{vc7} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{vc7} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{vc7} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{vc7} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{vc7} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{vc7} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{vc7} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{vc7} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{vc7} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{vc7} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{dc7} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{dc7} + \text{ \text{dc7}} + \text{ \text{dc7}} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{dc7} + \text{dc7} + \text{dc7} + \text{dc7} + \text{dc7} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{dc7} + \text{dc7} + \text{dc7} + \text{dc7} + \text{dc7} + \text{dc7} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{dc7} + \text{dc7} + \text{dc7} + \text{dc7} + \text{dc7} + \text{dc7} + \text{dc7} \) 67. \(\Delta \text{dc7} + \t



18.₩xe7

Other possibilities were 18.\$\phi\$1 or 18.\$\mathbb{\ell}\$xf6. After the text Black can at the very least force a draw through perpetual check.

18... ≣xa2

Like this. With 18...@d5 Black could have continued the fight.

Black should not demand too much from his position: 21... [基本]? 22. [基本] 豐太月 23.fxg7 [基8 24.全8+ wins for White.

And now 22... 基xd1+? 23. 基xd1 管xg5 would have been bad in view of 24. ②xb7.

23. c3

SI 6.5

☐ Timman ■ Gelfand

Wijk aan Zee 2002

1.e4 c5 2.包f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.包xd4 ①f6 5.包c3 a6 6.息g5 e6 7.f4 ②bd7 8.豐f3 豐c7 9.0-0-0 b5 10.兔xb5!?

A sacrifice Black should always be on his guard against in the Najdorf. Black must play very accurately to stay affoat.

10...axb5 11.②dxb5 wb8 12.e5 温a5 12...dxe5? is met by 13.要xa8 wxa8 14.②c7+ 元d8 15.②xa8, but 12...②b7 is playable; 13.要c2 dxe5 14.要c4 leads to a complicated

The books give the game Kengis-Dvoiris, Sosiet Union 1982: 14., acc 7 15. acc 7 4 de 8 16. acd 7 €xd7 17. acd 1 acx 5 18. fxg5 acc 19. €335 5 g6 20. aci 1 wg8 21. acx 7, and now Black Should have gone 21., acc 10. bcf, with perpetual check after 22. acc 7 acc 12. acc 22. a

13.exf6 axf6



14. û.h6!

After 14. \(\Delta\)h4? \(\Boxed{\Bar}\)xb5 White has nothing left.

14...\(\Delta\)xh6

This is more or less forced: \(14...\Bar{\Bar}\)xb5?!

15.@xd6+ se7 16.sb1 ≌d8

The moves 16... ⊕b6 and 16... ₩a8 have also been played here.

17. Ihe1 @b6 18. @cb5 Ixb5
To eliminate the threat of 19. Øf5+.

But in Lutz-Gelfand, Dortmund 2002, played six months later, it turned out that Black can easily play 18...\$\(\text{a}\)6!; there followed 19.\(\text{c}\)15 \(\text{-c}\)8 20.\(\text{g}\)6 23.\(\text{d}\)5 \(\text{g}\)76 24.\(\text{d}\)75 22.\(\text{g}\)76 25.\(\text{d}\)75 23.\(\text{d}\)75 \(\text{d}\)75 24.\(\text{d}\)75 25.\(\text{d}\)75 \(\text{d}\)75 \(\text

19.@xb5 **ℤxd**1+

All this was still known territory! Timman had prepared the variation at home and knew it inside out, whereas Gelfand had to find every move over the board. He had already used a lot of time here. The text may be a slight inaccuracy.

An earlier game saw 19... €c4! 20. ₩b3 (20. ₩c6 €d2+ 21. ¢a1 &xf4 is good for Black) 20... €d2+ 21. ₹a2 ₹a2 ₹a2 22. ₩b4+ £d6 23. g3 &d7 24. ₩xd6+ ₩xd6, and a draw was agreed, Brodsky-Timoschenko, Moscow

1992. The endgame will offer roughly equal chances

Now 20...@c4 can be strongly met by 21.營c6!.

21.a3 @e5

Bad is 21. のc42 22 費d3 のd2+ 23 公a1 âh6 24. wa3+ dd7 25. wb4, and White is winning

22 Wa3+ che8 23 @d6+ @xd6 24 Wxd6 ₩vd6 25 \u00e4vd6

This is the endgame White had been aiming for. The passed pawns on the queenside give him the best chances

25 @d5 26.c4 de72

This loses: 26 @e3 was called for

27. Ec6 @b7 28.cxd5! @xc6 29.dxc6

Now Black will lose the pawn ending. After the careless 30.b4 Black gets a pawn duo on

f5 and e5, and White can whistle for his win. After the text Black resigns. It will be followed by 30...\$xc6 31.b4 \$b5 32.a3 \$c4 33. cc2 e5 34.cd2 cb5 35.cc3 cb6 36.a4.

SI 7 4

☐ Maeder

■ Czava

Correspondence game 1977

1 e4 c5 2 0 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 0 xd4 @ f6 5. @ c3 a6 6. 2 a5 e6 7.f4 b5

Polugaevsky's move, which leads to extremely sharp positions.

8.e5!? The only way to try and refute Black's set-up

After 8.a3 @bd7 or 8.ad3 @bd7 or 8.\f3 8...dxe5 9.fxe5 @c7 10.exf6

The alternative is 10.\mathbb{m}e2. See the game

Mendes-Ribeiro

10... we5+ 11. e2 wxq5 12. wd3

This variation has been subjected to countless analyses, but even in 2003 it is still unclear who is objectively better. In practice White has scored the better results, and no wonder: White is on the war path!

12.0-0 has also been played. A recent example is 12... \$\bar{2}a7 13.\$\bar{w}d3 \$\bar{a}d7 14.\$\@e4 \$\bar{w}e5\$ 15 公f3 費xb2 16.費e3 âb7 17.a4 b4 18.其ab1 響xc2 19.包fg5! 響c7 20. axb4! axe4 21.@xe4 @xb4 22.fxg7 \mathbb{\mathbb{Z}g8? (22...\@c3!) 23. 2 f6+ 2 d8 24. 2 x g8! 2 c5 25. 2 f6 2 x e3+ 26. \$\psi\h1 \$\psi\c8 27. \Oxd7!, and Black resigned. Leko-Ghaem Maghami, Erevan 2001.

Beautiful to watch but hard to fathom! 12...\wxf6 13.\pif1

And here many games have 13.0-0-0. 13...₩e5

After 13... #g6 White's strongest continuation is 14. Wh3!?, with the threat of 15. Ah5.

14. Ad1!?

After 14.0-0-0 Black can go 14... 27 15.@f3 響f4+ 16.@d2 實c7, but the position remains hard to assess 14 @f3 has also been tried

14...¤a7

Less good is 14... #c7?!; after 15. ah5! g6 16.2£f3 Za7 17.4c6, White was better in Beliavsky-Polugaevsky, Moscow 1981.

15. 2f3 #c7 16. 2a5! f5

A strong reply to 16... b6?! is 17.0ce4!. 17. Wd4!



17... II a8?

This loses by force. 17...h5?! is also suspect in view of 18. axf5! exf5 19. ad5 實d7 20. Ad3!, followed by 21. Ae3+ and a probably winning attack.

Black's best option seems to be 17...\parageq e7!? 18. ûh5+ g6 19. wxh8 wxg5 20. ûf3 Ig7, with an extremely unclear position. The white queen is boxed in, but how is Black to exploit this? White continues 21.2f2 b4 22. Ifd2 &d7 23. De2. The handful of practical examples we have show a good score for White. What does your computer think of it? 18. \#xf5! \@e7

After 18...exf5, 19. h5+ g6 20. d5 wins. 19 IIf7 @c5 20 IIxe7+! @xe7 21.0 ce4 Black resigned in view of 21... \$\bar{2}\$d7 22.\$\bar{2}\$h5+ v6 23.分f6+ or 21...分c6 22.費b6.

SI 7.8

☐ Mendes Ribeiro, F

Correspondence game 1987

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 6 f6 5.4c3 a6 6.âq5 e6 7.f4 b5 8.e5 dxe5 9.fxe5 #c7 10.#e2

After this move, too, countless games and theoretical analyses have failed to bring clarity.

10...@fd7 11.0-0-0 @b7 The e5 pawn must not be taken: 11...\@xe5? 12 @xe5 @xe5 13 @dxb5 or 11 @xe59

12.4 dxb5 axb5 13.實xe5. 12.微g4 微xe5

But not 12...@xe5? in view of 13.@xe6! fxe6. 14 Wxe6+ @e7 15 @xb5+

13 0 d3

The thematic sacrifice 13.@xb5?! is unclear: 13 avb5 14 Thel b5! 15 衛b4 衛c5 16.4 exb5 \(\mathbb{Z}\) xa2 17.\(\mathbb{Q}\)b1 \(\mathbb{Q}\)d5, and White seems to have nothing.

13...h6 14. 9h4

Here 14.@xe6?! hxg5 15.\textbf{\textbf{L}}he1? doesn't work, as 15... \$\mu\$h4 leaves the queen with nowhere to go! 15. Idel Ih4 16. Wdl fxe6 17. Exe5 @xe5 is also good for Black; he has plenty of material for the queen.

14...a5



15 @xe6!?

According to the books, 15,2g3 We3+ is good for Black, while 15. The 1 h5 16. wxg5 @h6 17. #xe5 @xe5 18. @xb5+ axb5 19.費xh6 基xh6 20.包f5 包bd7 21.包xh6 âxg2 22, 2xb5 \(\bar{a}\)xa2 23.\(\dag{a}\)b1 \(\bar{a}\)a4 leads to an equal endgame.

15 h5

Taking the knight, 15...fxe6?, is very suspect, as Black will not survive 16. The 1: 16...h5 (16... #f4+? 17. #xf4 gxf4 18. 2g6 mate!) 17. ag6+ ad8 18. axh5 實c5 19. ag3, and Black is certain to lose

16 @h3! @h6

We'll take another look at capturing on e6: 16...fxc6? 17.草he1 賞f4+ 18.如b1 賞e4 19.草xe6+ 公d8 20.豐xg4 hxg4 21.泉xg5+ \$27 22 \$64+ \$2d8 23 \$65 \$xe2 24 \$2d5 @xd5 25.\\ xd5 \@e7. Thus far a correspondence game Sarink-Boll from 1992, Now White could have won with 26. 2xb8! Axb8 27. \$\bar{q}\$ xa6 \$\bar{q}\$ xh2 28. \$\bar{q}\$ xd7+ \$\bar{q}\$ e8 29. \$\bar{q}\$ xg4.

17.ŵb1 a4

And again: 17...fxe6? 18.\(\mathbb{L}\) he1 g4 19.\(\alpha\) g6+ 全f8 20.響d3, with a winning attack.

18.0 c7+! Wxc7 19. The1+ 9f8

After 19...@e5?, 20.\g3 \@g7 (20...@d7 21.@f5) 21.@xb5+ wins. 20. ge7+ gg8 21. gxh5 gg7 22. gg5!?

Unclear is 22. 實xg4 @e5 23. 實g5 @bd7. 22...Øc6

Less good is 22... #xh2?! 23. 2d6! #xd6 24. @h7+, or 22... \(\bar{L}\)h6?! 23. \(\alpha\)f5 \(\alpha\)c6 24. \(\alpha\)d8! ₩b7 25 @c4 @xe4 26 Txe4 f6 27 Te8+ @f8 28. Wxg4.

23. @ f5 @ ce5 24. @ d6 W b6

29. axh8 dxh8 30. de4 an endgame arises in which White is a pawn up.

25. Xxe5 @ xe5 26. @ xe5 f6?

For a long time Black kept finding the right move, but now he slips up. Correct was 26...費h6! 27.單d8+ 罩xd8 28.費xd8+ 全f8 29. axh8 響xh8 30. 響g5+ 響g7, and now the endgame is hard to win, both after 31, \wxg7+ @xg7 32.@e4 @xe4 33.@xe4 f5 and 31.\frac{\pi}{2}f4 @xg2 32.@xg4.

27. wxq4

And Black resigned in view of 27...fxe5 28. ae6+ ah7 (28... af8 29. 實f5+) 29. 實h5+ ♠h6 30.耳d7 mate, or 27...耳c8 28.耳d7 賞g1+ 29.5\d1.

SI 8.5

☐ Peleshev

■ Odeev

Correspondence game 1988 1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4

@f6 5.@c3 a6 6.@q5 e6 7.f4 ₩b6 8 @d2 @xh2

Gligoric once said: never take on b2, even when it's correct. Now the risks are indeed considerable, but this 'poisoned pawn variation' is nevertheless played a lot, especially by correspondence players. Despite the many examples it is still not clear how poisonous the h2 pawn really is.

9.0 b3

Threatening 10.a3 and 11. 22, catching the

9 ₩a3

Escaping the trap. Also playable, however, is 9... oc6 in order to meet 10.a3? with 10 . €a5!. Also possible is 9... €bd7, when 10 a3? can be strongly met by 10...@c5.

10. axf6 qxf6 11. ae2 h5

To prevent White from putting his bishop on h5 11 @c6 12 0-0 @d7 13 @h5 would be difficult for Black

12.0-0 @c6 Playable alternatives are 12... 2d7 and 12... 響b4. The theory books will provide you with more information

13 Oh1 Wh4 14.₩e3 d5

13...\bar{w}b2? is bad, as it leads back into the trap: 14.a3, followed by 15.@c3.

9 直雪

Black returns his pawn in order to get counterplay. Less good is the other pawn sac 14. f52! 15.exf5 d5 16.fxe6 fxe6 17.c3 費e7 18 @1d2 @d7 19 @f3, with good play for White Robatsch-Kortchnoi Palma de Mallorca 1972.

15.exd5 @e7 16.@c3 @f5

Here, 16... 2d7 has been suggested as an improvement.

17. wd3 wb6+ 18.耳f2

18 &h12! h4 (threatening 19...@g3+) 19.@g4 4 e3 20 @a4 Wa7 costs White the exchange. 18 @d6

After 18 @e3 19 @e4 @xd3 20 @xd3 @e7 21. Zel White has the better position, Mecking-Tal Las Palmas 1975.

19.5 e4

This looks obvious, but it doesn't yield much. Another possibility is 19.dxe6 fxe6 20.#e4 4/7 (after 20...₩e3 White has the trick 21.公d5! 費xe4 22.公xf6+, winning a pawn, but 20... #c6!? is worth considering: after 21 響xc6+ bxc6 22. ad3 由行 23. axf5 exf5. Black's nawn formation is in tatters, but taking into account his bishop pair, his position isn't all that much worse) 21 @c4 We3 22.費xf5! 費xc3 23.費e4; with 23... e5 Black can win the exchange, but then 24.4)xc5 豐xa1+ 25.算f1 is strong.

19... 9 xf4 20.0 xf6+ dxf8!



20... \$\phie7\$ is strongly met by 21.dxe6!, as witness 21...fxe6?! 22.費xf5 費xf2+ 23.\$xf2 ext5 24 @d5+ with advantage: 21...@xc6? 22.@d5+ @xd5 23.\xd5 @xh2+ 24.\xxh2 響x/2 25.響e5+, winning; and 21...拿xf6 22. 曾f3 實e3 23.實xf4 實xf4 24. [xf4, with a slightly better position for White.

21. @c3 @xh2+ 22. @xh2

Suspect is 22. \$\psi f1?!, when Black can safely play the strong 22... \$e7!. He can also try

22... De3+ 23. de1 â.g3, although this is not completely clear after 24.0c5! (24.0d7+? @xd7 25. @xh8+ &e7 26. @xa8 @xg2+, and 26 del. After the text-move the game is drawn because of perpetual check.

22... #xf2 23. @d7+ @q8 24. @f6+ @f8 25.@d7+ @a8 26.@f6+ Draw.

SI 8 8

☐ Grechikhin

Popov, Valery Cherepovets 1997

1 e4 c5 2 0 f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0 xd4 @f6 5.@c3 a6 6.@g5 e6 7.f4 ₩b6 8. gd2 gxb2 9. lb1 ga3 10.f5 ac6 11.fxe6 fxe6 12.@xc6 bxc6 13.e5 @d5

For the main line, 13,...dxe5, see the games Brunner-Stohl and Gipslis-Kortchnoi.

14 @xd5 cxd5 15. e2 dxe5 16.0-0 Does White have sufficient compensation for the two sacrificed pawns? This is not clear, but the position of the black king is definitely

rather scary, and in the last analysis the aim of chess is to mate the enemy king. 16... II a7 Less good is 16...\(\hat{2}c5+?!\) 17.\(\dagger)h1\) \(\bar{\pi}f8\) 18.c4

□xfl+ 19.□xfl \(\text{\ti}\text{\tex{ of 21. We2.

17.c4 @c5+ 18.@h1 d4 19.@h5+

An important intermediate move to weaken square f6. Other tries have been 19 \mathbb{m}c2 and 19 學 43

22. xe7+

The other move, 22. \$\mathbb{I}\$f7, leads the game into a great theoretical complex about which we can only say here that things become extremely complicated and that both players have chances. Just consult the theory books.

22. £h6!? \$\Begin{align*} \Pige 23. \$\Begin{align*} \Pige 7 may be a good alternative

22... Exe7!



This is an important juncture in the game. Other moves are had: 22 Wxe72 23 Wa5+! 響c7 24.單b6 罩b7 25.c5 虫e7 26.罩xb7 響xb7 27.c6 winning. Nordby-Engel, correspondence game 1982/83 and 22... \$\delta xe7? 23 wo5+ cbd6 24 wh6! 耳h7 25 罩xb7 @xb7 26. #g7 #c8 27.c5+!, also winning, Paskanov-Kosenkov, correspondence game 1987.

23. #g5 c7 24. #fe1 #f8 25. #xe5 After 25.2c2 Black coolly plays 25... \$\mu f5!, with advantage.

25... Wb4! 26. Ic5+

Here, 26. Lee 1?! Lf5 27. Wg3+ Wd6 28. Wb3 \$\d\$ leads to advantage for Black. Rahn-G.Müller, correspondence game 1986. But 26. \psi g3!? is worth considering: 26...\psi d8 27. 2b3 Zef7 28. 2g1 Zf4, with an unclear position with roughly equal chances, Traut-Zilin, correspondence game 1996.

26 dd8 27 Ed1 @ya4 28 Eyc8+ doyc8 29 WC5+ @h8

Less good is 29... \$\pid8? 30.\bar{\textbf{2}}\textbf{b1!} (30.\bar{\textbf{2}}\textbf{x}\textbf{d4+}? #d7 is unclear) when Black can only play 30 If I+ and White is better after 31 Ixf1 ₩d7 32 ₩b6+

30 □h1+ sba8 31 ₩xe7

Now the game will quickly fizzle out to a draw. 31... Ib8 32. Ixb8+ *xb8 33. Wd8+ 36. #e7+ #b8 37. #d8+ #b7 38. #e7+ Draw

SI 8 9

Rrunner ■ Stobl

Dortmund 1990

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 @f6 5.@c3 a6 6.@g5 e6 7.f4 ₩b6 8. #d2 #xb2 9. #b1 #a3 10.f5 @c6 11 fxe6 fxe6 12 @xc6 bxc6 13.e5 dxe5 14. 2xf6 gxf6 15. 2e4 ₩xa2

Bad is 15...f5? in view of 16.&e2! fxe4 17. @h5+ sbe7 18.0-0.

16.\Zd1

16 @xf6+ looks obvious but after 16 . \$67 Black seems to have little to fear, e.g. 17. \$\mathbb{\pm}\$b3 響a1+ 18.含e2 曾d4 19.響g5 e4, according to an analysis by Nunn.

16...@e7 17.@e2

17 Ød6+ @xd6 18 @xd6 資a5+ 19 c3 罩a7 is not convincing either.

17...0-0 18.0-0 f5

Here 18... \$\bar{\pma}\$a7 is also possible, e.g. 19.\$\bar{\pma}\$f3 史h8 20.星g3 星d7 21.豐h6 星f7 22.豐h5 算xd1+ 23. axd1 費a5! 24.由f1 費d8! 25 賞xf7 賞xd1+ 26.由f2 賞xc2+ 27.由e3 盒c5+ 28.@xc5 實xc5+ 29.每f3 e4+! 30. \$\psi xe4 \psi c4+, and a draw. Black has perpetual check, G.Andersson-Poulsen, correspondence game 1991. 19. gh6

The critical position in this variation.

19... If7?

Not like this! 19...fxe4? is bad as well: 20. 基xf8+ &xf8 21. 實g5+ 由h8 22. 實f6+ 由g8 26.全行+ 基x行 27.資x行+ 含h8 28.費f6+ 含g8 29. gg 5+ gb 8 30 h 4 gd 6 31 h 5, and White had a winning attack, Grünfeld-Helmers, Luzern 1979

Correct is 19... #xc2!, e.g. 20. ad3 #xe2 21. Eg3+ \$\psi(7 22.\)Exf5+! exf5 23.\)Eg7+ \$\psi(e8)\$ 11 Wyo6+ dods 25 費h6+ does 26 變c6+ dods and a draw. Velimirovic-Ftacnik, Vrsac 1981. 20. Ed3 Eq7 21. Efd1!



21...fxe4

Other moves are no better: 21...\(\delta\)b7? 22 公f6+ Qxf6 (or 22. 本h8 23.@xh7 基xh7 24 IId8+! and mate!) 23 要xf6 IIf8 24.IId8 ■17 25. □xf8+ □xf8 26. 賣g5+ 如h8 27. □d7, and curtains: or 21 @d72 22 @f6+! @xf6 23 my f6 myc2 24 mye5 直d8 25 cbf1! 單行 26 曾g3+! 夏g7 27.實h4 夏b8 28.夏xd7 夏xd7 29 Exd7 Eb1+ 30 由f2 響c5+ 31.由f3 響c3+ 32 0/43 Iff1+ 33 the2, and Black resigned. Krempel-Svendsen, correspondence game 1990. Ouite complicated and virtually impossible to calculate over the board!

22 Td8+ @vd8 23 Tvd8+ df7 24 Wh5+ .∜f6?

Now Black loses More stubborn was 14 #26 which would have been followed by 25. #xh7+ Ig7 26. ah5+ de7 27. Ie8+ 点d6 28.實xg7 實b1+29.每f2 實xc2+30.每g3 ₩c3+ 31.\$h4. with advantage for White. Thus the analysis by the white player.

25 Wh4+ Ig5 26 Wh6+ Ig6 27 Wf8+ . q5 28.q3

Black resigned. There is no defence against the threat 29 h4 mate

SI 8 12

□ Gipslis ■ Kortchnoi

Leningrad 1963

1 e4 c5 2 0f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4.0 xd4 @f6 5.@c3 a6 6.@q5 e6 7.f4 ₩b6 8. Wd2 Wxb2 9. Ib1 Wa3 10.f5 @c6 11.fxe6 fxe6 12.@xc6 bxc6 13.e5 dxe5 14. 9 xf6 axf6 15.@e4 9.e7

For 15... ** xa2!?, see the game Brunner-Stohl.

16. û e2



16 0-02! Not a good move, but this was not yet known in 1963. Stronger is 16...h5, when after 17 草b3 資a4 the starting position of an extensive theoretical complex arises. White can choose between 18 c4 and Vitolinsh's sacrifice 18. 2xf6!? 2xf6 19.c4. It would go too far here to go into this more deeply, so I will limit myself to one example to illustrate White's 20 o3 @e7 21 0-0 草a7 22.草b8 草c7 23.費d3 ac5+ 24.由h1 由e7 25.實e4 由d6? (stronger 27.費g5+ gd6 28.基d1 gc7 29.基xd4 基xd4 30.費e5+ Id6 31.Ib2 c5 32.自f3 費xc4 33.費g7+ 算d7 34.費e5+ 具d6 35.費g7+ it's a

19

draw through perpetual check) 26.2d1+ 豐xd1+ 27. axd1 h4 28. 貴d3+ ad4 29.c5+ \$xc5 30, \$\mathbb{q}a3+, and White won, Beliavsky-Hübner, Tilburg 1981.

17. Ib3 Wa4 18.c4 wh8

18... If7 is met by 19.0-0 f5 20. Ig3+ \$\dispha h8 21. Wc3, winning, Vitolinsh-Gutman, Riga 1967, while after 18...f5 19.0-0! fxe4 (19...c5 20.星g3+ 空h8 21.響c3) 20.星g3+ 空h8 21. 算xf8+ âxf8 22. 費 g5 Black is also finished. 19.0-0 Ta7

19... 2f7 is met by 20. 2h5.

20. Wh6 f5?

This loses. More stubborn was 20. Wa5: after 21 @xf6! 幽c5+ 22 dbl @xf6 23 買xf6 耳g7 24.微e3! 微e7 25.耳xf8+ 微xf8 26.耳b8 White is better, but the game is by no means won yet.

21.Xq3 @b4

Now it is over at once: but 21 III7 22 @h5 fve4 23 @vf7 @c5+ 24 Te3! @ve3+ 25. #xe3 would not have saved Black either. nor would 21... \$\bar{\pi} g8 22.\$\bar{\pi} xg8+ \$\pi xg8\$ 23 公f6+ @xf6 24 要xf6 要a5 25 罩d1.

22.0 f6!

Black resigned. White is threatening 23.實f8+! axf8 24. Ig8 mate, to which there is no adequate reply: 22... Ed8 23. 4xh7 Exh7 24. 實f6+, or 22... af7 23. 實g5.

SI 9.2

☐ Keres

■ Naidorf Goteborg 1955

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 h6 9. @h4 g5?!

An interesting but dubious idea. In the same round of the tournament this was also played in Geller-Panno and Spassky-Pilnik! 10.fxq5 @fd7 11.@xe6!?

11.費h5!? 包e5 12.桌g3 桌xg5 13.桌e2 is another option, but the text is far more direct. 11...fxe6 12. @h5+ &f8 13. &b5!



Geller seems to have been the first player to go for this surprising bishop move, with Spassky and Keres following in his footsteps. After 13.2d3? the white attack stalls: 13. @e5 14.0-0+ do7 15 @e3 @bd7 13....gq7?

After 13 axh5? 14.0-0+ wins In Geller-Panno White was also winning after 13...@e5? 14.@g3 @xg5 15.0-0+ @e7 16. xe5. This line reveals the point of 13. & b5!: if 14. . Ø bd7 then 15. & xd7 wins. Later it was discovered that Black's strongest possibility is 13... \$\mu\$h7!; despite extensive analyses, no clear win for White was found after this move, although he can count on at least a draw through perpetual check, as in. for instance. Timman-Stean, London 1973: 14.費g6 里行 15.費xh6+ 会g8 16.里引 里x引+ 17 @xf1 @c5 18 @c4 @xc4 and drawn 14 0-0 ©e5

15.9 a3 a a6 16.axh6+ Exh6 17.Ef7+!

Other moves are no better: 18. Wh8 19 If1+ @f6 20 @e8+1 sbxe8 21 @xe6+ sbe7 19.費h7+ 虫f8 20.費xg6 axb5 21.罩f1.

19.3f1+ de8

Or 19,...全f6 20.費h7+ 容f8 21.費xg6, winning.

20.₩xq6+ фd7 21.¤f7 @c6

After 21...b4, 22.@d5! exd5 23.exd5! wins, while 21 \$66 would have been met by 22. Wh7 . g.g5 23.e5 d5 24. Wd3.



22.0 d5!

The knight intervenes decisively! The pinning of @e7 will spell the end for Black. 22 Exa2

Or 22...exd5 23. #xd6+ &e8 24. #g6!, with decisive threats, e.g. 24...\$\psi d7 25.exd5.

23.h4

Up to this point, the game Spassky-Pilnik was identical! Now Spassky played 23.h3, also with a quick win for White. 23... wh8 24. 0 xe7 0 xe7 25. wq5

Black resigned.

SI 9.7

☐ Georgiev, Krum

Inkiny

Varna 1977

1 e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 f6 5.公c3 a6 6.âq5 e6 7.f4 âe7 8.₩f3

#c7 9 0-0-0 Øbd7 10. Ød3 b5 11. □he1 £b7 12. 2 d5?!

A well-known sacrifice in these kinds of position with the rook on e1, but its correctness is more than questionable. For 12. #g3, see the game Lassen-Karlsson

12 @xd5

Black can probably just take the knight with the nawn. In the game Vitolinsh-Zilber, Soviet Union 1973. White won beautifully: 12 exd5!? 13 Ø/f5 &f8? 14.e5 dxe5 15.fxe5 @c4 16 @xe4 dxe4 17 \(\textbf{\pi} \text{xe4} \(\text{\pi} \text{c4} \) 18.c6 \(\text{\pi} \text{f6} \) 19.exf7++ dxf7 20.@h6+, and Black resigned. Later it was found, however, that after 13... 本f8! 14. 實g3 dxe4 15. axe4 axe4 16. \$\pi xe4 \pi c5! White does not have enough compensation for the sacrificed piece.

13.exd5 @xq5

13... axd5? is met by 14. wxd5! exd5 15. \(\Pi\)xe7+ \(\phi\)f8 16. \(\phi\)f5 \(\Pi\)d8 17. \(\phi\)e6!, winning.



14 Txe6+12

14.fxg5 @e5 vields White nothing. Hence this spectacular rook sacrifice.

14...fxe6 15.@xe6

After 15. #h5+? g6 16. 2xg6+ hxg6! 17 wxh8+ \$68 18.5 xe6 &xf4+ 19.5 xf4 0-0-0 Black has averted all danger.

15... wb6 16. h5+ q6 17. xq5

17. axg6+?! is unclear: 17... 空e7 18.響xg5+ ②f6, e.g. 19. ah5 響e3+ 20. ab1 里ag8 21.公g7 桌c8 22.響h4 Exg7 23.Ee1 響xe1+ 24. wxe1+ &d8, and Black is probably fine. 17...費e3+ 18.фb1

Does White now really have enough compensation for his rook?



19.₩h6

19. Wh4 is probably stronger: after 19... Zae8 20.單e1 單d2 (20... 單b6? loses after 21. 單b6) White can go for perpetual check with 21. 公d8+! 算xd8 22. 變e7+ 全g8 23. 變e6+.

19 @xd521

Later it was found that Black should have played 19... Zag8!, e.g. 20. 2g5+ de8 21. Wh4 如d8! 22. Ie1 Wb6 23. Of7++ 如c8 24. 公xh8 基xh8 25. Qxg6 管d8!, with advantage for Black Maliszewski-Surowiak correspondence game 1992.

20. # q7+! xe6 21.f5+! qxf5 22. xf5+! There's no end to White's sacrifices. But will he win?

22... 少xf5 23.耳f1+ 資f4?

Yes now White wins! But after 23 de4! 24. @g4+! (not 24. @e7+? @e6! (24... De5? 25. Wh4+) 25. Wxe6+ 2e5, and White is finished) 24...\$e5 25.\$f5+\$e6 26.\$f3+\$e7 27... 李e6 28. 賞g4+ it is perpetual check and a draw, according to an analysis by Nunn. 24. @xd7+ &a5 25.h4+

Black resigned. There follows 25... #xh4 26. 實g7+ 由h5 27. 其f5+, and mate.

SI 9 7

☐ Lassen

14.e5

■ Karlsson Correspondence game 1981

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 0f6 5.0 c3 a6 6.2 c5 e6 7.f4 2 e7 8. @f3 @c7 9.0-0-0 @bd7 10.@d3 b5 11.\he1 @b7 12. g a3 b4 13. d5!? exd5

Now, as opposed to Georgiev-Inkiov, 13...@xd5 is not good: 14.exd5 @xd5 15.@xe7 \$\psi xe7 16.\$\times xe6! \$\times xe6 17.f5 g6 18.fxe6 fxe6 19.實g4 公e5 20.Exe5 dxe5 21.費h4+ 公f7 22 耳f1+ 208 23. Wf6, and White wins.

The alternative is 14.exd5. An example: 14... ad8 15. 響e3 包b6 16. 包f5 包bxd5 17. 實d4 单f8 18. ae4 由c8 19. 0 xe7 ②xe4 20.0e8 曾c5 21.曾xh8 0e3 22.星e2 0c3 23. 實xf8 @xe2+ 24. 由d2 實d4+ 25. 由xe2 * and a man draw, Kohlweyer-Tomczak, Baden-Baden 1987 Phew! For details of this sub-variation I. will have to refer you to the theory books.

14...dxe5 15.fxe5



15 @e42

This is inferior as we will see Correct is 15...6.h5!, with the interesting main line 16.e6!? 公xg3 17.exf7+ \$xf7 18. [[xe7+ \$g8] 19 hxg3 \ \mathbb{w}xg3 \ 20.\Oe6 \ \mathbb{w}e5 \ 21.\Omegaf1 \ \Of8 22.0f5 &c8 23. Ee8 &f7 24. Ee7+ &g8. draw Hellers-De Firmian, Biel 1989.

16. xe4 axq5+

If 16...dxe4, then 17.@xe7 @xe5 18.@xe5 6 xe5 19. @xb4, and wins.

17. wxg5 dxe4 18. 2f5! wxe5 19. Ef1! Less convincing is 19.@d6+ 由f8 20.要xe5 4 xe5 21.@xb7 @g4.

19....a.c6

Other moves are no better: 19...f6 20.\pixe7 0-0-0 21. 2d6+ \$c7 22. 2xb7, with a large advantage for White: after 22... hg8 23. mxh7 国h8 24 衛行 24 、 国hf8? fails to 25. 国xd7+, or 19...h6 20.@xg7+ 虚f8 21.\u00e4xf7+! 虚g8 (21...\$xf7 22.\(\beta\)xd7+) 22.\(\beta\)g6 \(\beta\)g5+ (22...公f8 23. 基xf8+ 本xf8 24. 基f1+, and mate) 23 質xe5 hxg5 24.算fxd7, also with a large advantage for White. Variations by Lassen.

20.6 xq7+ &f8 21. @h6! &b5

21...響xg7 22.響xc6 looks equally sad, while 21... Qd5 is met by 22. \$\bigg\{ 23. \bigg\{ d6+} \} 4 g8 24. mxd5, and wins.

22. 15+ da8

Or 22... \$\psie 8 23. \Od6+ \psie 7 24. \Bxt7+ \psi d8 25. Exd7+! \(\overline{a}\)xd7 26. \(\overline{a}\)f7+, losing the queen. 23 IIf4 @ f8

Or 23... e2 24. axd7 ae8 25. ag5+ af8 26.5 h6 資xg5 27. axf7 mate.

24. @ a7+!

Black resigned in view of 24... #xg7 25.@e7

SI 9.9

Rodriguez, Amador

Sulipa

Albacete 1995

1 e4 c5 2 0 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 0 xd4 ' f6 5. 0c3 a6 6. 2 g5 e6 7.f4 2 e7 8. ₩f3

₩c7 9.0-0-0 \(\tilde{O}\) bd7 10.q4 b5 11.\(\tilde{x}\) xf6 Øxf6 12.a5 Ød7 13.f5 €xa5+

Black takes the pawn with check, but he will have to give it back anyway. For the alternative 13... ©c5, see the games Tsaturian-Bangiev. Oortwiin-Schut and Ruch-Schmall.

14.фb1 @e5 15.費h5 With this attack on 2g5 White wins back the

nawn on e6 15 We7 For the other move, 15...\dds, see the game

Luther-Kersten on page 26. 16.4 xe6 Here, 16.fxe6g617.exf7+ \$xf718.\perpecceq e2.2g4 19 Wf2+ Wf6 is good for Black, but 16. Eg1 £f6 17.fxe6 g6 18.exf7+ #xf7 leads to an ap-

proximately equal position.

16.... £xe6 Now 16...g6 is not such a good idea, as 17. wxg5 fxe6 (Timman-Ljubojevic, Niksic

1983) 18. Wh6 is good for White now. 17.fxe6 q6 18.exf7+ \$xf7 19.\tilde{w}h3

19. we2 has also been played several times. Please look it up in the books. 19...\$a7 20.9d5

This is a minor drawback of 15... #e7: the knight jumps to d5 with tempo. But the consequences are not all that terrible for Black. White looks strong thanks to the position of his knight and the weakness of square e6, but the e5 knight holds the black position reasonably together.



20. Wa72!

Better is 20...\dot\d8! e.g. 21.\dagga \hat{\pi}14 22.實c3 萬a7 23.皇h3 耳f8 24.耳hf1 耳af7 28. wxe1 公xd3 29.cxd3 Exh3 30,公f4 wh4 31. #c3+ &h6, with an equal endgame. Gil.Garcia-R.Vera, Linares 1993.

21 We6! Wc5

21... ad8 is met by 22.h4 ahe8 23. wh3 ah6 24.h5, with advantage for White, according to the white player.

22.h4 Tae8 23.Wh3 @h6 24 @e2!

Stronger than 24.h5 Hef8!, and Black has counterplay.

24... Ief8 25. We6! If2

After 25... #17 White continues 26 h5. 26. Ihf1 Ihf8 27.b4! Wc6

No better is 27... 費a7 28. 費xd6 ②f7 29. 費e6. and White is winning, again according to the white player

28.Exf2 Exf2 29.Ef1!

It's all so simple. The rook swap exposes the big weakness in the black position; square f6! 29... Exf1+ 30. 9 xf1 9 d2

Otherwise White plays 31.聯f6+ 如g8 32 De7 mate

31. #f6+ #h6 32. #f2

Black resigned, as 32...@c3 33.\@e3+ costs him his bishop.

SI 9 9

☐ Oortwiin Schut

Correspondence game 1994

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 ⊕f6 5.⊕c3 a6 6.≜q5 e6 7.f4 ≜e7 8.₩f3 @xf6 12.g5 @d7 13.f5 @c5 14.f6 gxf6 15.axf6 &f8 16.Ea1

Besides this move by Perenvi, White has a wide choice: 16.a3, 16.ah3, 16.mh5, and even 16 @ 65

16...h5

16... dd7 has also been played and was likewise met by 17. 2g7, with an extremely complicated position after 17... 2xg7 18.fxg7 算g8 19.e5 0-0-0 20.exd6 彎b6.

17.¤q7!? b4

19. 2dxb5!, winning, But 17... wd8 is an option, when Black threatens 18... 2xg7 19.fxg7 ₩g5+. White can choose between 18. wb1. 18 Øc6 ₩b6 19 Øe7 and 18 b4



18.9 d5! exd5 19.exd5 @d7

The alternative is 19... 2g4, but after 20. 2e1+ \$\d821.\dagger{\text{#}}\text{f4, followed by h3. Black is facing difficulties

20.40c6 .2b7 Bad is 20...@e5? 21.@xe5 dxe5 22.d6 @b7

23. 實b3. @xd6.24 其xd6 實xd6.25 實xf7+ 少d8 26. 賣xb7 昌b8 27. 賣f7, with a winning position for White, G.Mohr-Orel, Slovenia 1993.

21.@h3 @xc6 22.dxc6 @e5 23.@d7+

23... 9xd7 is impossible of course 24.cxd7+ and Ta8 falls

24. We4 Wa5

Luring the white rook forward! 24... \$\mathbb{\pi}\$ b6 is also a possibility: 25.2e6! \$\price c7 (25...fxe6?) 26.c7+) 26.2xf7 \$\mathbb{Z}\$17.27.2\d5+ \pib8 28.\$\mathbb{Z}\$28.\$\mathbb{Z}\$28.\$\mathbb{Z}\$3 Ic7 29. Ib3 @xc6 30.a3 \$a7 31.axb4 @e5 with difficult complications, Glatt-Maliangkay, correspondence game 1997.

25. Ed5

After other moves Black plays 25 ... \$\precepc7.

25 @b6 25 Wxa22 is bad in view of 26 Exe5! dxe5

27 Wyes 26. Exe5

Now this move yields no more than a draw. 26...dxe5 27.\ xe5



27... g xq7

With 27. #c5 Black could have gone for the win but then 28 We8+ 会c7 29. Wxa8 exg7 30.曾b7+ 全d6 31.fxg7 星g8 32.盒c8 is none too clear

28 We7+

28.fxg7?! 竇g1+ 29.本d2 昌h6 should be good tor Black: 30.\perpenses e8+? \phic7 31.\perpenses xa8 \pif2+. and White is mated. Funnily enough, however, the position after 30.c3 is not all that clear. After the text-move a draw was agreed: 28... 中c7 29. 響e5+ is perpetual check.

SI 9 9

Ruch

Schmall

Correspondence game 1998

1.e4 c5 2.0 f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0 xd4 0 f6 5. c3 a6 6. 2 g5 e6 7.f4 2 e7 8. 2 f3 2 c7 9.0-0-0 4bd7 10.g4 b5 11.exf6 4xf6 12.q5 @d7 13.f5 @c5 14.f6 gxf6 15.gxf6

£f8 16.Eg1 h5 17.Eg7!? b4 18.△d5! exd5 19.exd5 @d7



20.@e6!?

Another way to insert the knight into the black position! But this certainly isn't stronger than 20.0c6, as in Oortwijn-Schut, White can count himself lucky with the perpetual that will soon arise.

20...₩a5

Very bad is 20...fxe6?; after 21.dxe6 Black might as well resign.

21 doh1 @e5

21...fxe6? is still bad, as 22.dxe6 \subseteq b8 is met by 23. Eg8!, and wins, Very unclear is 21 . axe7 22.fxg7 里g8 23.實xh5 ab7 24. 22 @e5 25. 2e4; Black is a rook up, but he has an extremely awkward position.

22 @e4 @d7

22...fxe6? is still not good: 23.dxe6 \subsetem b8 24. Ed5!, and White wins, 22... £xg7? is also bad now: 23.fxg7 草g8 24.響h7 草xg7 25. axg7+ ac7 26. 響xh5, with a winning advantage But 22. Th8!? is a possibility, when Black does threaten to take on e6.

23.Eq5 Ec8?!

Maybe 23... \$\text{\$\psi\$}b6!\$ is stronger. In that case, 24.€\@7+ \$\d8 25.\\\\xe5 dxe5 26.\\\\\ce6+ is not good in view of 26 ... \$\pi_c8\$, so White will have to play something like 24. 2e2, after which it is questionable whether he has enough compensation for the sacrificed piece.

24. ⊕g7+ ⊕d8 25. ≣xe5! dxe5 26. ⊕e6+! ⊕e8

But not 26...fxe6? 27.dxe6 or 26...\(\hat{\textit{\textit{x}}}\)xe6? 27.dxe6+, and White wins.

After the text a draw was agreed in view of the perpetual check 27. 全97+ 全48 (but not 27...全xg7? 28.fxg7 置g8 29.豐h7) 28.全6+.

SI 9.9

☐ Tsaturian ■ Bangiev

Correspondence game 1988

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 ⊕f6 5.⊕c3 a6 6.æg5 e6 7.f4 æe7 8.∰f3 ∰c7 9.0-0-0 ⊡bd7 10.g4 b5 11.@xf6 ⊕xf6 12.g5 ⊕d7 13.f5 ⊕c5 14.f6 gxf6 15.qxf6 æf8 16.∰h5 ≝a8

Black can also play 16....âd7 17..âh3 b4 18.♠ce2 0-0-0, and after 19.₩xf7 âh6+ 20.�b1 ₫df8 21.₩h5 ₫xf6 22.ℤhf1 ℤhf8 23.ℤxf6 Дxf6 24.₩h4 ℤg6 the position is roughly equal.

17.e5!?

The idea behind the aggressive text-move is to open up the d-file. It is important that Black has no reason to fear 17. ₹xh7: 17... ₹g6 18. ₹gh4 (or 18. ₹gh8 ♣h6 19. ₹g8 ♣g6, with a repetition of moves) 18... 14. 19. ₹ce2 ♣b7 20. £p3 ₹gh8, and Black is not bad.



17...dxe5?

After 18...âd7 White had prepared 19.@xe6!.

Forced, as 19...₩b8 runs into 20.\(\alpha\)c6.
20 \(\pi\)xe5! \(\alpha\)a6

20. ■ xe5! ⊕a6 20... ≜h6+ 21. ⊈b1 ⊈f8 is no better: 22. ⊕c6 ⊕b7 23. ⊑d8+! ⊕xd8 24. ∰d6+, and mate.

21.©151 &b7

Again, other moves are no better: 21....\(\bar{\pi}\) 62.\(\theta\) 046+ \(\phi\) xd6+ \(\phi\) xd2+25.\(\pi\) xb2 \(\bar{\pi}\) 26.\(\phi\) 04- \(\phi\) xd6+ \(\phi\) xd6

24.譽h5. 22.萬hf1!

22...â.c6

Or 22... **Eg6** 23. **Qg7**+ **Q**xg7 24.fxg7 **Qe7** 25 **Qd6** f6 26 **Qf5**+

23. 2bd6+ êxd6 24.₩xd6

Black resigned in view of 24... 賞c5 25.包g7+ 互xg7 26.fxg7 賞xd6 27.互xd6 由e7 28.互xc6, and White wins easily.

SI 9.9

☐ Luther

■ Kersten

Bad Zwesten 1997

1.e4 c5 2.2.3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.2.xd4 4.6 5.2.c3 a6 6.2.g5 e6 7.14 2.e7 8.873 8c7 9.0-0-0 2.bd7 10.g4 b5 11.2.xf6 2.xf6 12.g5 2.d7 13.f5 2.xg5+ 14.2.b1 2.e5 15.875 878

This is different from Rodriguez-Sulipa, where Black played 15... #e7.

16.h4!?

This move has yielded White good results. Other possibilities are 16. Eg1, 16.fxe6 and 16.4 xe6. If you want to know more about them, you'll have to consult the books.

16... 46 17.fxe6 g6?!

Now the black king looks in vain for a safe haven. Better is 17...0-0, although now 18.≜h3 \$\ddots\$h8 19.\$\dots\$d5 fxe6 20.\dots\$xe6 favours White.

18.exf7+ \$\dots\$xf7 19.\disph6 \disphg 20.\dispf4+

20...\$\psi_e8\$ was preferable here, although it looks anything but solid.

21.₩g3 ₩d8

After 21...\(\hat{\omega}\) b7 White has 22.\(\hat{\omega}\) xb5, and Black cannot take back: 22...\(\ax\) axb5? 23.\(\hat{\omega}\) fh1, losing the queen. But 22.\(\hat{\omega}\) h3 isn't half bad either.

22.\(\frac{\sigma}{\omega}\) d5



22...Af8

After 22... Ee8 White plays 23. 863 & f8 24... h3, and wins. After 22... & White can choose between 23. & h3 and 23.h5.

23.₩b3!

23. ♦ h3!? was strong here again; exchanging • e8 underlines the weakness of square e6.

23... ⊕e8

There was no other move!

24. xb5+!

24. 6 h3 was still a strong possibility, but the

text is far more amusing, of course.

24...axb5 25.4xb5 If7

25... <u>Eas</u>, although more stubborn, was also insufficient: 26.¢dc/t + der 27 Z.Ka/G b.55 28.¢xb5 **w**as 29.**w**d5, and Black will be unable to extricate himself, e.g. 29... **w**b/d 3.0h3 ½d/7 3.14 Elb8 32.23 **w**as 33..E6+! ½xc6 34.**w**/d6+ ±f7 35.Ef1+, and it's totally finished

SI 9.10

519.10

☐ Bryson ■ Pereira, Alvaro

Correspondence game 1989

1.e4 c5 2. \bigcirc 13 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4. \bigcirc xd4 \bigcirc 16 5. \bigcirc c3 a6 6. \bigcirc g5 e6 7.f4 h6 8. \bigcirc 2 h4 \bigcirc 2 9. \bigcirc 8 gc7 10.0-0-0 \bigcirc bd7 11. \bigcirc 2 h5

For this variation, too, please consult the books, 11... £b8 is also played here. After the text White can unleash great complications.

The alternative is $12.2 \times 16 = 0.000 \times 16 \times 13.000 \times 13.000 \times 13.000 \times 14.000 \times 13.000 \times 13$

12...Ձb7



13.exf6!? @xf3 14.@xf3 d5

After 14 #c82! 15 fxe7 White is better: he has three pieces for the queen. Another possibility, however, is 14... axf6 15. axf6 \(\mathbb{Z} \)c8: 16. exg7 單h7 17. eh5! 響c5! 18.f5 耳xg7 19. £xe6 ₩e3+ 20. \$b1 £e5! (less good is 20... **国**g8?!; after 21. **国**hel 實f2 22. 企e4 21.@xg7+ \$\pmuf8 22.f6 b4 23.@a4 (after 23.@d5. 23...@e4 is awkward) 23...@c4 24.0f5 We5 25.2g4 (things are looking good for White, but Black can escape with perpetual check) 25...\\pornim xb2+! 26.\Oxb2 @a3+ 27.\$a1 @xc2+ 28.\$b1 @a3+, draw, Euwe-Tal, played over the phone in 1961.

15 @xe6!?

15.fxe7? is bad in view of 15... \mathbb{W}xf4+. Better is 15.fxg7 **E**g8 16.@xd5, e.g. 16...@xh4?! (16... \$\mu c 8! should be stronger) 17 \$\hat{a} xa8 \$\hat{a} f6 18 f5 響f4+ 19 如b1 @xd4 20 @e2 響xf5 21.@xd4 ₩h5 22.&f3, with good play for White, Preinfalk-Keller, correspondence game 1972.

15...fxe6 16.@h5+ q6!



After 16...\$\psi d8?! 17.fxe7+ \$\psi c8. 18.g3!?. Pereira, looks good for White.

17. £xg6+ \$f8 18.fxe7+ \$g7 19. £g3

19... \$\prescript{\prescript{g}}{\prescript{g}}\$ is impossible, of course, in view of 20 f5+

20 f5 Wc4

20... ₩c5?! 21.@e2 is good for White, e.g. 21... #e3+ 22. #d2. followed by 23. #e1 or 23 5) 64

21.fxe6! bxc3

21... \$\infty f6 22.\hat{a}d3 \pic6 is also worth considering, After both 23. 2e2 曾xe6 24. 其he1 曾xe7 25.@d4 and 23.Ehf1 bxc3 24.@e5 cxb2+ 25. axb2 響xe6 26. ade1 響b6 White may be slightly better, but it is not clear.

22.exd7 \ xa2

22... ±xg6 may also be playable, e.g. 23.2e5 cxb2+ 24 @xb2 Wf4+ 25 Ud2 Ubd8 26,exd8₩ Exd8, and the endgame is not bad for Black

23 9 65+1 23.bxc3? 竇a3+ 24.\$d2 竇xe7 is good for

23... xq6 24. xc3 wa1+ 25. d2 wa4 26. @ xh8

There is no better move, but now Black keeps the pernetual.

26... #f4+

Or 26... 賞xd7 27.章c3 賞xe7 28.幸c1. with a roughly equal ending.

27. 0c3 @c4+ 28.0d2 @f4+ 29.0c3 ₩c4+ 30. Φd2 ₩f4+

Draw

SI 10.12

☐ Unzicker

Fischer

Varna Olympiad 1962 1.e4 c5 2.9f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4

€ f6 5.€ c3 a6 6. e2 A less sharp way to play against the Naidorf

than 6 @ o5 6...e5 7. 2b3 &e6 8.0-0 2bd7 9.f4 #c7 10.f5 @c4 11.a4 @e7 12.@e3

In later years, 12.2c5 was played a few times, with reasonable results. An example is Oll-Kasparov, Moscow Olympiad 1994: 12 0-013 \$\psi h1 \pm fc8 14 a5 h6 15 \text{ a x f6 \text{ 16 5xc4 @xc4 17 @f3 Ec7 18.0d2 (afterwards Oll indicated 18. a4 學c6 19.g4, when he assesses White as slightly better) 18... Wb4 19 耳fb1 基ac8 20. 基a4 響c5 21. 基ba1, with an approximately equal position.

12...0-0 13.a5

All this has been in the theory books for years. The important thing is that Black can meet 13.g4 with 13...d5!.

13...b5!?

13... If c8 has also been played. 14.axb6 e.p. @xb6



15 0 xh62!

Better is 15. \$\pm\$h1!, postponing the swap until after 15... afc8 (15... axe2 16. wxe2 Oc4 can be met strongly by 17.2g5): 16.2xb6 ₩xb6 17. 0 xc4 Exc4 18. We2 Eac8 19. Ea2, followed by 20. Efa1, and White is not bad.

15... @xb6+ 16. @h1 @b5! This little move yields Black a fine position.

It White does not capture on b5. Black plays 17... c6!, followed by a6-a5-a4. The e4 nawn is a weak snot in the white position. 17 xb5

After 17 Oxb5 axb5 18 @d3 Ea4!? Black's position is also preferable.

17...axb5 18. 0d5 €xd5 19. ₩xd5 \(\bar{\pi} a4! \) 20.c3 @a6! 21.h3

In Ed-Eischer Willemstad Candidates' tournament 1962, played some months earlier, Black also had good play after 21. Ead1 Ec8.

21... Ec8 22. Efe1 h6 23. 1 h2 2 q5 24.q3?

24. adl can be met by 24...b4! 25. add ₩xd6 26. Exd6 bxc3 27.bxc3 Exc3, and Black keeps calling the shots. But the text fatally weakens the white position by suddenly giving Black tactical possibilities.

24... #a7! 25. #g2 Ea2 26. #f1

And suddenly it's all over! 26. axa2 ★xa2 27. Le2 Exc3 is equally hopeless.



26... Exc3 White resigned.

SI 11 7

☐ Kuzmin, Gennady Groszpeter

Kucadaci 1990

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 8.0-0 0-0 9. \$h1

White has many other options here, e.g. 9.a4 and 9 @e3

9... h5

Black also has a wide choice: 9 h6 9 \@e6 9... #c7, 9... @c6, and a few more. See the books.

10.47d5

10.a4 b4, and only then 11.@d5 is an alternative

10... 2xd5 11. ₩xd5 IIa7 12. 2e3 2e6 13 Wd1 Td7

After 13... \$\bar{L}\$b7 14.\$\bar{L}\$c1 \$\Ocdot\$ c6 15.c4 \$\Ocdot\$ a5! 16.公xa5 徵xa5 17.cxb5 axb5 18.a3 徵a8! 19.2d3 Ed8 things were roughly equal in Short-Kasparov, Novgorod 1994, but 14.a4!? or 14. me1!? ac6 15. ad1 are possible improvements for White

14 a4!? h4

14...bxa4 15. Exa4 £g5!? is probably not a bad idea. Black has counterplay: 16.2xg5 ₩xσ5 17 ₩c1 ₩xc1 18 Φxc1 \(\mathbb{E}\)c8 19.c3 шь7 20 €/d3 @c4.21 шы шсс7.22 €/с1 @b5 and a draw. Wahls-Arnason, Groningen 1990.

15.f4 \(\psi\) c7?!

Black allows the advance f4-f5. But 15...exf4 16 @xf4 d5 17 e5 or 15, d5 16 @c5 @xc5 17 @xc5 dxe4 18 Wel doesn't look convincing either.

16.f5 &c4?!

Now Black is hit by a kingside attack. Better. although still not enough, is 16... axb3 17 cxb3

17. 9 xc4 Wxc4



18.f6! @xf6 19.Exf6! gxf6 20.@q4+

The only way to cover f6. 22.4 d4!

Great!

22...₩e7

22,..exd4 is met by 23.@xd4 Eg8 24,@xf6+ ■g7 25. ₩g5, and Black is helpless.

23. 2f5 ₩e6 24. If1

Now the main threat is Ef1-f3-h3 and mate. 24...d5 25. a7! #e7

Or 25... \$\pmy xg7 26.\pm\h6+ \$\pm\h8 27.\pm\xf8. 26. a c5!

Another good one!

26. Wxc5 27.0 h5 Black resigned; he is totally lost: 27... ad6

SI 12.4



■ Vera

Cienfuegos 1996

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 a6 6.f4 @c7 7.@f3 g6 8.âe3 h5 9 a3

White can also allow ...b4, e.g. 9, ad3 ab7 10.g4 b4 11. ace2 &g7 12.0-0-0 abd7, with a difficult position and roughly equal chances. Leko-Van Wely, Tilburg 1997.

9...@bd7 10.q4 @c5 11.q5 @fxe4! The start of interesting complications.

12 @ ye4

Black meets 12 ad3 with 12 @xc3 13 實xa8 實b7!: 14.實xb7 息xb7 15.0-0 包d5。 and Black is fine.

12 ... 9 xe4 13. Wxe4 @b7 14. 9 xb5! White has to think of something, otherwise he loses his Eh1

14...axb5 15.\dd e5! 16.fxe5 16. axb5+?! 由d8 17.fxe5 曾a5+ 18.ad2

21...@xh1 is good for Black. Vera. 16... gq7! 17. axb5+ df8 18.0-0 axe5 19 WC4 We7

A critical moment in the game.

Ï

20.c3

Here 20. \$\pixf7+!? was an option: 20...\partset{\pi}xf7 21 里门 &f3 22 響xf7+ 会xf7 23.異xf3+ 会e7. with an unclear position.

20. \$\mathbb{L}(2!)? was also worth looking at: 20... \$\psi xb2 21.\pmaf1 f5 22.\pmxf5+! gxf5 23.Exf5+ @g7 24.@d4+ @xd4+ 25.Wxd4+ **\$**v8 26.\$c4+ d5 27.\$xd5+ \$xd5 28.\$xd5+ **\$**g7 29. **\$\perpertaural** d4+ **\$\perpertaural** d5+, with perpetual check according to Vera's analysis.

20... Ec8 21. We2?!

Vera gave this move a big question mark, but the real loser comes a move later. According to Vera. 21. \mega! was correct, e.g. 21...h6 (21... 0.xc31? at once may be stronger) 22.h4 #xc3 23.@d4 @xd4+ 24.\xd4 \quad \quad xd4 25. Zae1, which doesn't look bad for White. 21...h6! 22.qxh6?

Now the end is very near. Also bad is 22.h4? #e6! 23. 2f4 hxg5 24. 2xg5 ₩h3, and Black wins: or 22.@c4? @xh2+! 23.@xh2 hxg5+ 24. 山g3 響e5+ 25. 章f4 重h3+! 26. 由xh3 ₩h8+ and mate!

22. #12 hxg5 23. ad4, indicated by Bönsch, would still have allowed White to continue the fight, although 23...g4 24.2xe5 ₩xe5 25 \mathbb{\mathbb{H}} xe5 dxe5 26.\mathbb{\mathbb{H}} d2 g3 is better for Black. 22... xh2+! 23. wxh2

Or 23. 4xh2 管h4+24, 4g1 管g3+, and mate. 23. Wxe3+ 24. If2 IIxh6

White resigned.

SI 12 6

□ Nunn

Cserna Lugano 1984

1 e4 c5 2 0 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4.0 xd4

The books give 6...e5 7. 2f3 2bd7 as the main line here.

7. 2d3 g6 8.0-0 2g7 9. 2f3 2bd7 10. We1 e5

To prevent the push 11.e5. But Black can probably afford to just allows it, e.g. 10...b5 11.e5 dxe5 12.fxe5 @g4 13.e6 fxe6 14.\hbarefinal h4 @de5 15.@xe5 @xe5 16.&e4 &b7, with an approximately equal position. Almasi-Lalic. Pula 1996

11 a4 b6 12 fxe5 dxe5 13 @h4 @b7

With 13...h6 Black now can prevent the coming bishop sortie, but it is not an attractive move: he will have trouble castling kingside and White simply plays 14.2e3, followed by @d2-c4

14. h6 0-0 15. a5!



15... Tfc8

The position after 15.2g5! has been seen in several games. The important thing is that Black cannot relieve the pressure on his king with 15...@h5?, as this is met by 16.@xg7 \$\psix g7 \ 17.\Pix f7+!\Pix f7 \ 18.\De6+, winning the queen. 15... ae8 16.g4! and 15... d6 16 Ead1 are not satisfactory for Black either. The idea behind the text is 16 \@c5+17.\pi\1 Wf8, but Black never gets around to it. 16.由h1 賞d6 17.皇xq7 axq7 18.公xf7! This is how White exploits the weakness of

f7. The sacrifice is undoubtedly correct: White gets three pawns for the piece and the black king is denied a safe haven. 18...\$xf7 19.₩xh7+ \$e6 20.₩xq6

According to Nunn, 20. Axf6+1? 2xf6 21. wxb7 was another possibility. 20... we7 21. ad1! wh7 22. g3 e7 22... ■g8 is awkward in view of 23. ac4+ de7 24 章 x g 8 世 x g 8 25 響 d 3

23 @d5+1 23. Ef5?! Ec5 is less clear. 23...@xd5 24.exd5



24...@h6?

Now Black has sealed his own fate, 24... \#g8? is also bad: 25.草xf6! \$\psi\$xf6 26.掌h4+ \$\psi\$f7 27 耳f1+ 如e8 28.d6 質g7 29.全g6+, and mate. Relatively best was 24...e4!?, but with 25.Ede1 Eg8 26.Wc7! Wg6 27.g3 Eac8 28.d6+ de6 29. 量b7! White keeps a strong attack going, again according to Nunn.

Or 27... xd7 28. xe5. 28. Exf6!

Black resigned.

SI 13.2

☐ Zaitsev ■ Dementiev

Riga 1970 1 e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4

Øf6 5 Øc3 a6 6 Øc4 e6 7. Øe3 b5 8. 2b3 ₩c7

Going for the pawn with 8...b4?! 9.2a4 @xe4? is very risky: 10.@xe6! fxe6 11.@b6 @b7 12 € xa8 @xa8 13 @xe6, and the black king is stuck in the centre. Playable, however, are 8 @e7 and 8 @b7

9 f4 h421

Black keeps eyeing pawn e4. But 9... ke7 and completing his development was better. 10.6 a4 6 bd7

Again taking on e4 is not advisable: 10. @xe42! 11 f5 e5 12 @f3 with the threat of 13.40b6.

11.f5 e5



12 @e6!

A thematic sacrifice in this line. See also the game Kalegin-Dvoiris, SI 13.12. 12...fxe6 13.fxe6 40c5

13... ab8 is met by 14. ab6 ab7 15. a4+. 14 @xc5 dxc5 15.0-0 c4?!

This makes it easier for White to demonstrate the correctness of his piece sacrifice. But other moves also yield him good chances, e.g. 15 Ve7 16 9a4+ \$68 17 Exf6+ 9xf6 15... 2d6 16.2e5 Ef8 17.2xf6 gxf6 18. Wh5+ 会d8 19. Lad1.

16.Xxf6! axf6 Or 16...cxb3 17.\bar{w}h5+ g6 18.\bar{z}xg6 hxg6

19 ₩x o6+ \$e7.20 #d1 and mate 17 8h5+ \$e7 18 8f7+ \$d6 19 e7! ₩ve7

19... xe7 runs into 20. d5. mate. 20.₩xc4

Black resigned.

SI 13 10

☐ Timotic ■ Veron

Metz 2000 1 e4 c5 2 0 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 0 xd4

6 f6 5.4c3 a6 6.4c4 e6 7.4b3 b5 8. 0.a5!? The most common move is 8.0-0. The text is

un interesting sub-variation

8. e7 9. wf3 wc7 9... #b6 is a good alternative.

10 0-0-0

Black can meet 10. &xf6?! &xf6 11.e5 effectively with 11... xe5! (less good is 11... \$b7?!, as White then has the strong 12. vd5!) 12. wxa8 &xd4 13. wf3 &b7, and Black has good play for the exchange.

10 0-021

Stronger is 10...@bd7!, with a complicated position with roughly equal chances after, for mstance, 11.\mathbb{I}he1 0-0 12.\mathbb{\mathbb{m}}h3 \overline{\Omega}c5.

11.e5! @b7

11 ..dxe5 is met by 12. £xf6 £xf6 (12...exd4 13 8 ve7 Wve7 14 Wva8 9 h7 15 0 d51 evd5 16 響a7 yields too little compensation for the exchange) 13.0 xe6 fxe6 14. wxa8 b4, and now instead of 15.0e4? ae7 16 aa4? 爾b6! 0 | Varavin-Karjakin, Alushta 2002, correct is 15 € a4 and if 15 - 0 e7 16 @e4

12.exf6! @xf3 13.fxe7 @xd1?

This loses at once. His only move was 13... Ee8: it is true that White then plays 14.0xf3, and should be better with three pieces for the queen, but at least Black can still out up a lot of resistance, as in the game Meszaros-Vajda, Hungary 1998: 14...d5 15. 2d4 h6 16. ke3 ₩xe7 17.f4 2d7 18.g4 Eac8 19.h4, and White created chances for himself



14 @ xe6!

Black resigned. And it's easy to see that this hammerblow left him little choice. In an earlier game between two strong masters (later grandmasters!) this move was overlooked: 14,exf8費+? \$\psixf8 15.\pm xd1 d5 and the game Yudasin-Novikov, Kuibyshev 1986 was eventually drawn!

SI 13.12

☐ Adoms Sadler

Dublin 1993

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 € f6 5.€ c3 a6 6. € c4 e6 7. € b3 b5 8.0-0 âb7 9.≅e1 @bd7 10.âg5 ₩b6 11.a4 b4 12. 2 d5!?

A well-known knight sacrifice in the Sicilian. The results are often quite unclear, but White nearly always gets good attacking chances. 12...exd5 13.exd5+



13...@e5

After 13...\$\d8 White continues 14.6\c6+!. After 14 ... 2xc6 15.dxc6 @xc6 16.2d5 @c8 17 Wh51? &e7 18 Wxf7 he has good chances. In the game Golubev-Mantovani, Biel 1992. Black played 14...\$c7, followed by an extraordinarily beautiful attacking spectacle: 15.a5 曾b5 16.公d4 曾c5 17.ac3 axd5 18.c4 bxc3 e.p. 19. ac1! wxa5 20. axc3+ 2c5?! (20. \$b7 offered more chances of survival) 21. @xd5@xd5.22. 電f3! @xc3.23.電c6+束b8 24.bxc3! 幸a7 25.温b1 温b8 26.要xc5+! 輩b6 (26...dxc5 27. 2c6+, and mate) 27. 2c6+ 2a8 28. Exb6. and Black resigned, Golubev has analysed this game deeply for both the Informator and NIC Yearbook 26, but we don't have the space to go into his analyses here. 14 a5 @c5 15 @e3

15.f4 is also good, but the text generates all kinds of additional threats.

15...₩c8

Other moves are no better, 15... 2e7 loses the queen after 16.0c6 wb5 17.0xe5 dxe5 18. a4. as does 15... ad5 16. a4+ d8 17. 2e6+, 15., 4xd5 16. 4a4+ 2fd7 17. 2e6 ₩c8 18. 2xf8 gives White a large advantage.

16 @ a4± doe7

16...@fd7 is also met by 17.f4, e.g. 17...@g6 18.0f5 âe7 19.âd4 \$d8 20.\$xe7 @xe7 21 @xd6 winning or 17... @xd5 18.fxe5 dxe5 19 @f4 @c5 20 Exe5+ .@c6 21.: hl @xd4_22 Wxd4_0-0_23 Exe6_fxe6_24.@xd7 直xf4 25. 賞xf4 賞xd7 26. 賞xb4, with a better endgame. Thus Adams' analysis.

17.f4 @xd5 18.fxe5 dxe5 19.@h5! f6 20. g f2

Now White simply threatens to continue with 21. Lae1 or 21. 23. The black king is in a most unfortunate position.

20...a6

Or 20... 中d6 21. 實行, or 20... 公f4 21. [[xe5+!] fxe5 22 #xe5+ winning.

21.Exe5+! &f7

There is nothing better: 21...fxe5 22.\mathbb{\mathbb{w}}xe5+ 虫f7 23.賣xh8, or 21...虫d6 22.臭g3! gxh5 23. IIe6++, with a nice mate: 23...\$c5 24.9 b3+ sbc4 25 #e4

22.\f3 \Oc7 23.\f5+! Another knight sac for good measure. It is all over

24...qxf5 25.\daggagag q3+ &f7 26.\daggab3+ &d5 27.Xxd5 Black resigned.

SI 13.12

☐ Kalegin ■ Dvoiris

Soviet Union 1988

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 € f6 5. € c3 a6 6. £ c4 e6 7. £ b3 b5

The same ambitious move as in the previous game. Other options are 7... £e7 or 7... 6bd7 to develop his pieces.

8 0-0 b4

For 8... \$b7, see the game Adams-Sadler. The safest possibility should be 8... &e7, followed soon by castling kingside.

9. a4 9.d7

9... xe4?! is very dangerous in view of 10.f4, followed by 11.f5, with good attacking chances: or 10 Tel d5 11 @f4

10 f4 6 c6

10.../ixe4? is still impossible, of course, in view of 11.f5.

11.f5!? e5 In their annotations to the game the players Buy that 11... 2xd4 12. ₩xd4 e5 13. ₩xb4 d5 14. 實e1 dxe4 15. ae3 is good for White.

12.0 e6!? The same sacrifice as in Zaitsey-Dementiey. but now Black has better defensive possibilites because of the knight on c6.

12...fxe6 13.fxe6 @c8 14.@q5 @e7 After 14...h5 15.@xf6 gxf6 16.@d5 @b7 17.c3 Black has good compensation for his

piece, according to Kalegin and Dvoiris. 15. 0 xf6 0 xf6



16. #xf6!

This second sacrifice puts Black on the brink. 16...\wxf6

Not, of course, 16...gxf6? 17.\documentship h5+, and mate

17.₩xd6 @d4!

On his way to the safety of perpetual check! Bad is 17...@d82 18.@c5. followed by 19 .ca4+.

18.5 b6 @xe6

18...@e2+ has been indicated as less good: 19. ah1 ag3+ 20.hxg3 Wh6+ 21. ag1 We3+ 22.\$\psif1!\$\pm\$f8+ 23.\pm\xf8+ \$\pm\xf8 24.e7+!\$\pm e8 (24... \$xe7? 25. \$\d5+, an important point!) 25. âa4+ âd7 26. âxd7+ &f7 27. @xa8 &xe7 28 世d1 窗ve4 29 心b6 窗vc2 30 含a4 窗vb2 31.2b3, and the endgame should favour White: three pieces for the queen! But after 31 ... e4 things are still not all that clear.

19 @xa8

Now we see the drawing combination Black had envisaged. The other possibility, 19.≜xe6, was rejected in view of 19... ad8 20. 2d7+ str7 at some stage, but after 21. 賞d5+ 卓f8 (21... 卓g6 22. 全c4) 22. 賞c5+ 由行 23.公d5 實g5 24.基f1+ 由g6 25.c3 White does have some compensation for the exchange.

19...@e2+ 20.\$h1 @g3+! 21.hxg3 ₩h6+ 22. aq1 ₩e3+ 23. ah2

After 23. 本f1? 星f8+ 24. 費xf8+ 本xf8 25.2xe6 @h6! 26.2h3 @c6 the endgame is good for Black 23...\#h6+

Draw.

SI 13.14

□ Polgar, Sofia ■ Winslow

New York 1987

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 √nf6 5.√nc3 a6 6.≜c4 e6 7.≜b3 b5 8.0-0 êe7 9. ₩ f3 ₩ b6 10. êe3 ₩ b7 11. ₩ q3 0 d721

Better moves are 11...@c6 and 11...b4. 11...0-0 12. âh6 @e8, as in Kasparov-Gelfand (SI 13.15), has also been played. 12.@f5! exf5

12...b4 is met by 13. 響xg7 罩g8 14. 響xf6! @xf6 15.@xd6+, and White wins back the

aucen with interest.

13. ₩xg7 Ef8 14. £g5 @xe4

14... 2h5 15. \$\mathbb{m}\$h6 loses 2h5, while after 14...@g8 White can choose between 15. axf7+ axf7 16. 常xg8+ af8 17. 常xh7 and 15 @xe7 @xe7 16 @d5, in both cases with worrying consequences for Black

15 @xe7 dxe7 16 @d5+ dxe8 17 Eac1 17.f3 is also strong, as 17...費a7+ 18.фh1 ②f2+ is not possible in view of 19. Exf2 響xf2 20. ₩f6. and mate.

17...@c6

After 17 @e6 18 @f6+ @xf6 (or 18 de7 19 @xe6 @xe6 20 @xe4 fxe4 21 @xf8) 19. Exe6+ it is curtains.

18. 2 f6+ \$e7 19. ₩ q5! \$e6?

The sad 19... \$\pi d8\$ was the only option Black had left: after 20 @xe4+ \$c7.21 @f6 White

has a large advantage. 20. 2xe4+ f6

Or 20. \$\psi d7 21.\$\overline{1}6+ \$\psi c7 22.\$\overline{1}xe6 fxe6 23. Exe6. winning.

21.9 xf6 And Black resigned in view of 21... xf6

22 #xe6+ SI 13.15

☐ Kasparov ■ Gelfand

Linares 1993 1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 € f6 5.€ c3 a6 6.€ c4 e6 7.€ b3 b5 8.0-0 2e7 9.₩f3

This move has been played in many games over the last 10 years. White threatens 10.c5, preventing Black from castling and gaining time for 10. #g3 0-0 11. 2. h6.

9...₩c7

After 9...@h7?!. 10.@xe6! fxe6 11.@xe6 is very annoying.

10.\\alpha a3 0-0

Black can also play 10...@c6! here: 11.@xc6 響xc6 12, Ee1 (12, 響xg7?! can't be good: 12... 萬g8 13. 響h6 @xe4, and Black has all the chances) 12... 2b7, with roughly equal play. It's all to be found in the theory books.

11. 2h6 Ø e8 12. □ad1

Here too all kinds of different moves have been tried such as 12 a3 and 12 db1. Again. I have to refer the reader to the books.

12....2d7 13.4 f3!?

And here 13.a3 and 13.f4 are alternatives. Again: see the books! 13...b4

Afterwards it was discovered that Black can maybe play 13...@c6; but after 14.&f4 IId8 15.e5! White has quite good play.

14.@e2 a5 15.@f4! \$h8

This is forced. After 15...a4? 16.@xg7! @xg7 17. h5 Black might as well resign.

16.2q5 @f6

16...f6? is met by 17. xe6, e.g. 17...fxg5 18.42g6+, and mate. And after 16...\$xg5 17.@xg5 a4 18.@xe6 @xe6 (18...fxe6? is not good in view of 19.2g6+! \$\preceq\$g8 20.2e7+ \$\psi h8 21.\(\times xh7!, \text{ winning} \) 19.\(\times fxe6 \) fxe6 20 のxe6 挙行 21 のxf8 要xf8 22 e5 White is hetter

17 当h4!

White's kingside action reaches its climax!



17... 9 b52

This loses by force, After 17...a4 the game continues 18.0h5 axb3 19.0xf6! 2xf6 (19...h6 20.@xh6! @xf6 21.@g5! @xg5

22. \$\div xg7++! \div xg7 23.\div xg5+ \div h7 24.\did3 e5 25. Eg3, and it's over) 20. 2xf6 exf6 21. 資xf6+ 由g8 22. 2g5! 島b5 (or 22... 皇c8 23 耳d3 耳d8 24 微h6) 23 微h6 f6 24 微xf8+ \$\psi x18 25 @\xe6+ \psi e7 26 @\xe7 and White wins. Also good for White is 17... 2c6 18.4 h5 @xh5 19. exe7 @xe7 20. 實xe7 具ac8 (20... Lae8 is no stronger: 21. wxd6 wxd6 22. Exd6 @b5 23. Ee1, as White meets 23...a4 with the tricky 24.2d5 exd5 25.2xd5, winning back his piece and staying a pawn up) 2) Exd6 @c6 22 圖xc7 Exc7 23 Ee1 公66 24. Id4. 17... ad8 is probably Black's best chance: after 18. 2d4 Le8 the position is unclear, e.g. 19.0h5 @xh5 20. @xh5 @xg5 21. wxg5 a4 22. ab5 wa5 23. axa4 wxa4 24.4xd6 \$\pm\$8 25.\$\Omegaxe8 &xe8 26.\$\Dm\$d8 \$\Omegac6\$ 27. Exa8 實xa8 28. Ea1 實a7. Thus Nikitin. 18.5 d41 @e8

After 18... &xf1 19. @dxe6! fxe6 20. &xe6 it's eurtains, e.g. 20...g6 (or 20...h6 21.@xh6 4 g8 22.@g6+ &h7 23.@xf8+ @xf8 24.@f5+

4h8 25. 2xg7++ 4xg7 26. 6h7+) 21. 2xg6+ ± 07.22 ₩h6 mate

19 dxe6! fxe6 20 0 xe6 Wa7 21 e5! dxe5 22.4xf8 4xf8 23.4xf6 gxf6 24. 耳d8! ad7 25. 資a4!

Black resigned in view of 25...\$27.26. We6.

SI 14 1

Handke Murdzia

Hamburg 2002

1.e4 c5 2.0 f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0 xd4 ∴ f6 5. 2 c3 a6 6. 2 α1

A somewhat bizarre move, probably mainly meant to sidesten the great theoretical complexes of the Najdorf.

A logical reply, but the moves 6,...g6, 6,...e6, 6...c5 and 6...b5 have been played as well. Before you know it, you'll be able to write an entire book on 6. Ig1!

7.q4 @xd4

Here 7...e6 8.g5 @d7 has been played a few times; otherwise, 7...d5 may be worth looking

8 Wxd4 e5

Bad is 8... 2xg4? 9. 2xg4! 4xg4 10. 2a4+ 質d7 (10...b5 11.4)xb5) 11.4b5, and 8... 9 x 942! runs into 9. 9 d5! 9 e5 10 \@c3! @c6 11. Exg7!. But 8...e6 is a playable move.

9. Wa4+

Zviagintsey-Ivanchuk, Elista 1998, saw 9. 曾d1 &e6 10.g5 @d7 11. 實f3, with good play for White. The text is rather over-ambitious. 9... ad7 10. b3 b5

With 10... 2c6!, which is good and safe, Black can avoid the white combination that now follows

11.a5 ≗e6

11... 2g8 12. 2d5 is good for White, of course.



12.axf6!?

A queen sacrifice! It was more or less forced really, as 12. ad5 axe4 13 ag2 ac5 is probably good for Black.

12... 2xb3 13.axb3 \(\mathbb{w} \) xf6?!

Better is 13 gxf6 when White can continue 14. Exa6 Exa6 15. 2xb5+ \$e7 16. 2d5+ \$e6 17. £xa6, with attacking chances after both and 17...151? 18.àcd fxe4 [9.àc]5 @a5+ 20.&c2. Knight and bishop for the queen isn't great compensation by itself, but the white pieces get extremely active. White can also try [4.2d57], when a possible continuation is 14...@e8 15.c3?? &c7 [6.2b6 @c6 17.2xa8 &d8 18.àc3?? &c7 [6.2b6 @c6 17.2xa8 &d8 18.àc3?? &c7 [6.2b6 @c6 17.2xa8 &d8 18.àc3?? &c7 [6.2b6 @c6 17.2xa8 &c7 [6.2] &c7 [6.2b6 &c7] &c7 [6.2b6 &c7] p.2xb5 @xc4 20.āxa6. Now Black should be able to make perpetual check and draw 20... wib+12.ixe2 @g1 2.2.àb6+ &c8 23.àc6 @g4+ 24.&c1 @g1 +...

14. âa5 ₩a6?

Now White wins quickly. Black had probably overlooked the theatened two-bishop mate. More stubborn was 14... week, when 15... £\(\text{\$\infty\$}\) = \$\text{\$\infty\$}\) = \$\text{\$\infty\$}\], \$\text{\$\infty\$}\] = \$\text{\$\infty\$}\], \$\text{\$\infty\$}\] = \$\text{\$\infty\$}\], \$\text{\$\infty}\}, \$\text{\$\infty\$}\], \$\text{\$\infty\$}\], \$\text{\$\infty



15...**I**b8

The big point is 15... \(\bar{L} xa6 16. \hat{L} xb5+, and the bishops deliver mate! \)

16.⊑a8!

The additional point; 16... **E**xa8 is also met by 17. **£**xb5, and mate.

19. ê e 8

Now the unfortunate queen is lost as well! Black resigned. SI 14 7

☐ Skalik

■ Kempinski

Gdansk 1994

1.e4 c5 2.ବିf3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.ବିxd4 ବିf6 5.ବିc3 a6 6.ଛe3

In 1984 the Encyclopaedia still buried this move in an unimportant sub-variation. It has gained enormous popularity since.

6... @a4

This reply, like the moves that follow it, is obvious enough, but Black does compromise his position slightly.

7.âg5 h6 8.âh4 g5 9.âg3 âg7 10.₩d2

For 10. £e2, see the game Tirard-Wu Wenjin.

10...h5 is met by 11.h4. 11. \$\Phi\$ & e6 12.h4

For the other move, 12.f3, see the game



16...**⊕e**3!

Extremely interesting but unfortunately incorrect is 16...a5? 17.fxg4 \(\mathbb{Z}\)xc3 18.bxc3 17... ()xfl 18.\(\mathbb{L}\)hxfl is good for White.

18.\(\mathbb{L}\)xc3 ()xd1!

The point of the previous moves.

19. vxb6 @xc3+ 20. c1
White should avoid the g7-al diagonal, for

obvious reasons.

20... bxa2+ 21. b2

But now he has no choice!

21... 2xe4+ 22. #d4
After 22. 2d4? 2xd2 23. 2xg7 #g8 Black

remains two pawns up.

22... ≜xd4+ 23.≜xd4 ⊕g3 24.≜xh8

24.≣g1 ≣g8 25. ⊕xa2 ⊕xf1 26.≣xf1 ≣xg2 is

24.Eg1 Eg8 25.@xa2 @xf1 26.Exf1 Exg2 is certainly not stronger.

24...@xh1 25.@xa2 f6 26.@q7 @q3

24... (2xh1 25. (2xh2 f6 26. (2g7 4) 27. (2d3 (2)f5 28. (2xf5

Here a draw was agreed. After 28...\$\text{\(\text{\pi}\)} xf5 \) 29.\$\text{\(\text{\phi}\)} b2 h5 the endgame is not totally clear, but a draw looks like the most logical result. All of this, by the way, is an analysis by Shirrov, published after his game against Oll!

SI 14.7

☐ Perez Gongora

Santa Clara 1998

1.e4 c5 2. \bigcirc 13 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4. \bigcirc xd4 4 f5 5. \bigcirc c3 a6 6. \bigcirc 23 \bigcirc 29 7. \bigcirc 295 h6 8. \bigcirc h4 g5 9. \bigcirc 293 \bigcirc 297 10. \bigcirc 402 \bigcirc 206 11. \bigcirc 50 \bigcirc 206 12.13 \bigcirc 2095 13. \bigcirc 215 14. \bigcirc 35 \bigcirc 35 15. \bigcirc 3d4

All of this can be found in the theory books. 15... 0 xd5

Playable alternatives are 15... #d7 and

15...@xd4 16.@xd4 f5!?.

16.exd5 @xd4 17.≜xd4 ₩c7 18.h4

After 18.0-0-0 Black also plays 18... \$\mathbb{\mathbb{m}} 57!, when 19.\(\mathbb{x} 63\)? is not good in view of the trick 19...\(\mathbb{C} c4 20.\(\mathbb{x} c4 \) \(\mathbb{x} c4 \) \(\mathbb{x} c4 \) \(\mathbb{x} c4 \) \(\mathbb{x} c4 \), which means that White must go 19.\(\mathbb{x} c5 \), with roughly equal play.

18... b7! 19.hxq5



19...hxg5

Suspect is 19...₩xd5?! 20.gxh6, e.g. 20...£f6 (or 20...₩xd4 21.gxn3 ±xxd4 22.2.0-0.0, or 20...₩xd4 21.hxg7 ₩xd2 22.±xd2) 21.c3 ±gs7? (well found but not good-but 21...₩c6 22.±dxl also favours White) 22.₩xg5 €xxf3 + 23.xxf3 ₩xg5 24.±xk8 f6 25.±gg7 ±f7 26.±d1, and with two bishops and a rook for the queen White had a winning endgame, Ye Jiangchuan-Xu Jun, Beijing 1993.

20.草xh8+ 泉xh8 21.響xg5 泉f6!

The strongest move, as 22.\display2?! \display35 23.\display23.\display24.\display36 is slightly

23.皇c3 皇h4+ 24.章d1 響e6 is slightly unpleasant for White.

22...₩xd5 23.êxe5

23 g xe5

Judging by another game between the same opponents (Cienfuegos 1998!), 23... \$\text{\mathbb{w}}\text{xe5} + 24 \$\text{\mathbb{w}}\text{xe5} \text{2xe5} 25.0-0-0 leads to caughty.

24. \(\pi xe5 \) \

White has to allow perpetual check; 27.幸3? is impossible in view of 27...盒f4+ 28.母f2 > d4+ 29.台e1 > d2 mate!

27...≜f4+ 28. de1

SI 14.7

■ Wu Wenjin

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 0f6 5.0c3 a6 6.ee3 0g4 7.eg5 h6 8.eh4 q5 9.eg3 eg7 10.ee2

For 10.\ddy d2, see the two previous games.

After 10...h5 White has a choice between 11.h4, 11.\(\hat{a}\)xg4 and 11.\(\hat{a}\)f5.

11.h4 @bc6 12.@b3 b5?!

With 12...g4!? or 12...gxh4!? Black can prevent the h-file from being opened. 13.hxg5 hxg5 14.星xh8+ 皇xh8 15.變d2

Very ambitious but quite suspect, as we will see. 15...e6 would be wiser.

16.₩xg5! @xb2?

And this proves fatal. Slightly better was 16...⊕b4, when White plays 17...⊕f1!, and Black remains in trouble, 17...⊕xb2?!, for in-

stance, is met strongly by 18.e5!, with the point of 18...\$xe5? (or 18...dxe5? 19.\$\frac{\pi}{2}\$bc4 20.\$\hat{\pi}\$xc4 bxc4 21.\$\frac{\pi}{2}\$dl) 19.\$\hat{\pi}\$xe5 dxe5 20.\$\hat{\pi}\$xb5+! xxb5 21.\$\frac{\pi}{2}\$g8+, winning.

17.₩q8+ фd7



18.@c5+!

Black had obviously not seen this uppercut coming.

Blocking in Black's al bishop, while at the same time threatening 25.£f3.

24...£b7 25.\$\psi d2! \& xq2

25...âd4 is met by 26.ᡚxb7 ᡚxb7 27.ᡚc6+, while 25...âb2 runs into 26.ჶc2 âa3 27.⊕xb7.

26. 4b3 &b2 27. c2 &xe5 28. xe5 The complications have left White with a

winning position. It is amusing to see how the white pieces will shortly start cornering the black king.

 37 € a5+ \$\psi\b6 38.\@d5+ \psi\a7

Or 38... \$\pi xa5 39.\hat{\textit{L}}b4+ \Pi a4 40.a3, and mate

39.√c8

Black resigned.

SI 14.8

☐ Lutz
■ Etacnik

German Bundesliga 2001

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4

4.f6 5. 2c3 a6 6. 2e3 e5 7. 2b3

The alternative is 7. 2f3; after 7... 2c7 8. 2c4

0.0 9.0 -0 2e6 10. 2b3 White may be fractio-

nally better.

Interesting! Black prevents the white set-up with g4. It goes without saying that this weakens his pawn structure.

9.₩d2 ⊕bd7 10.0-0-0 重c8 11.\$b1 âe7

12. ∮.d5 兔xd5 13.exd5 ⊕b6 14.兔xb6 竇xb6 has also been played a few times here. The position is probably roughly equal.

12. ♭5 13 ♭3

In order to play 14.g4 after all.

Pvcept that Black prevents it. An example with 13...@cf is the game Morozevich-Sadvakasov, Astana 2001: 14.94 @b6 15 \$xb6 @xb6 [16.gx 62d7 17.045 &xx45?! Bxcd5 g6 19.Beh 1 @c7 2.044 Df6 21.44! cvt4 22.@xf4 0-0.23.cd4 Efe8 24.045! &xh6 25.84 &cf6 and Black resigned.

14.f4

Then we'll do it this way! 14... 常c7 15. Lhe1 ②b6

After 15...exf4 16.2xf4 2e5 17.4d4 White is slightly better. According to the white player. 15...2641? was an option. 16. xb6! *xb6 17.4d5 *d8

18.c3 0-0 19. 9 c2 Te8?!

Taking on d5 is not possible, as this opens the C2-h7 diagonal. According to Lutz, Black could have played 19...2h5, e.g. 20.£xe7+ ₩xe7 21, ₩xd6 ₩xd6 22.£xd6 €xxf423.£g1 Efd8 24.£x66 €x7, and Black's strong €rf4 compensates him for the pawn.

20...@xf6 21.f5!? @xb3?

Now Black is strategically lost. The rest is easy to understand. According to Lutz, 21... âd7!? 22. 實xd6 âc6 was a better idea, and it's true that Black may have some counterplay for the pawn.

22. axb3 wa5 23. Eg1!
White still isn't interested in the d6 pawn!

White still isn't interested in the d6 pawn! 23... Ied8 24.g4 hxg3 e.p. 25. Ixg3 &f8



26.h4! ₩b6

26...\$\text{\(\text{\int}\}}}}}}} \eximes \eximting \eximting \text{\(\text{\(\text{\int}\}}}} \eximting \eximting \eximting \text{\(\text{\(\text{\(\text{\(\text{\(\text{\(\text{\(\text{\(\text{\(\text{\int}\}}}}} \eximting \eximting \eximting \eximtin \eximtin \eximting \eximtin \eximtin \eximtin \eximting \eximtin \eximtin \eximtin \exit{\(\texi\)}}}} \eximting \eximting \exiting \exitin \exiting \exiting \exiting \exiting \exiting \exiting \exiting \ex

27.h5 **@c6 28.ûd5 @d7 29.且dg1 Ec5** 29...\$\psi doesn'thelp either: 30.\textbf{\textit{z}}\text{xg7} \text{\text{\text{\text{2}}}\text{xg7}} \text{31.\text{\text{\text{2}}}\text{xg7} \text{\text{\text{\text{2}}}\text{xg7}} \text{28.3.h6.}

30.h6 gxh6 31.\(\pi\xh6+\pi\epsilon\) 32.\(\pi\xh6+\pi\)
An attractive final combination!
32.\(\pi\xh6+\pi\xh6

32...\$xf6 33.\(\mathbb{I}\)g6+ fxg6 34.\(\mathbb{I}\)xg6+ \(\psi\)e7 35.f6+

Black resigned in view of 35... ±f8 36. ±g8, mate.

SI 14 8

☐ Gonzales

Hmadi

Thessaloniki Olympiad 1984

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 ⊕f6 5.⊕c3 a6 6.≗e3 e5 7.⊕b3 .e6 8.₩d2 ⊕bd7 9.f4

After 10...全c4?! 11.全xc4 互xc4 12.營d3 互c8 13.0-0-0 White has a slight advantage. 11.axb3



11...d5!? 12.exd5?!

This gives Black good possibilities. Better was 12.0xd519 0xxe4 13.微cg 2m4+ 14.gc 2m4+ 14.gc 2m4+ 14.gc 3.xc 3m4 16.0-0-0 碳e4 17.gc 3.xc an unclear exchange sacrifice played in Nikolenko-Odeev, Naberezhnie Chelni 1988. White certainly has chancely.

Black was theatening 13... £e4. 13.£g5 h6 14.£h4 £e5 15.£d3 0-0 16.0-0 £xc3 17.bxc3 ₩xd5 18.£xf6 £e4! is also good for Black. 13... £e5

The other knight move, 13... 4b6, also looks good.

14. Wc4 @xc3+

14...豐d6!? was also an option; the b4 bishop is untouchable, as 15.豐xb4? 包d3+ loses the queen.

15. wxc3 0-0 16.0-0-0 @xd5 17. we1 @xb3+ 18. bb1 wc7 19. Exd5

After 19. d3 2d4 20. dxd4 exd4 Black has a winning advantage, while after 19.c4 2xe3 20. dxe3, 20... 2d4 or 20... 2c5 also favours Black.

19...₩xc2+ 20.da2



20...@c1+?

 25... 基d4! 26. axd4 基c1. After the text the players agreed a draw in view of 21. axc1 wa4+ 22. 会b1 wc2+, and perpetual check.

SI 14.10

☐ Watson ■ Kuczynski

German Bundesliga 1995

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 4.f6 5.⊕c3 a6 6.≜e3 e5 7.⊕b3 ≜e7 8.f3 ≜e6 9.₩d2 ⊕bd7 10.g4

The characteristic move for the English Attack.

10...0-0 10...h6 11.0-0-0 b5 12.h4 ©b6 has also been played several times here, e.g. by Kasparov. Black leaves the king 'safely' in the centre! 11.0-0-0 'wc7 12.h4 b5 13.h5 b4 14 0.d5 °xd5 15.exd5 506 16 °xd6

17.g5 ⊘d7 18.ŵh3 is probably wiser; after 18... € c5 19.⊙xc5 the position is roughly oqual.

17...a5 18.g5 @d7

₩xb6 17 0d3

| 16.49 \(\) \(\

19. Idg1 a4



20.≗xh7+

This looks winning, but appearances deceive. Black, by the way, would have met 20.\(\Delta\)al strongly with 20...a3 21.\(\Delta\)b3 \(\Delta\)c5, and White is lost.

And Black resigned?

No, he wins! The text removes the white rook from the h-file, and after a few moves a new black queen appears on a1.

black queen appears on a1.

24. Exg1 bxa2 25.gxf7+

25 Wh6. doesn't help either

25.谢hő doesn't help either in view of 25.a.1尚+26.dd fxg6 27.谢h8+dr7, and now the black kings escapes after 28.谢h7. 28...\phesis(28...\phesis(28...\phesis(212.9)\psec*29.\phesis(212.9)\phesis(212.9)\phesis(212.9)\phesis(212.9)\phesis(212.9)\phesis(212.9)\phesis(212.9)\phesis(212.9)\phesis(212.9)\phesis(212.9)\phesis(212.9)\phesis(212.9)\phesis(212.9)\phesis(212.9)\phesis(212.9)\phesis(212.9)\phisi(212.9)\

25... ±xf7 26. #g2 a1 # + 27. ±d2 #xg1!
Extraordinary; Black continues to put his queen en prise!

28.gxf8₩+ @xf8 29.₩xg1 IIa5

The complications are over. Now Black wins the endgame.

30.c4 bxc3+ e.p. 31.\$\psi\$xc3 \(\text{IC5+} \)
32.\$\psi\$b4 \(\text{Ixd5} \) 33.\$\psi\$a4 \(\text{Id4+} \) 34.\$\psi\$a5
\$\prightarrow\$d7 \(35.b4 \) d5 \(36.b5 \) \$\prightarrow\$d8+ \(37.\psi\$a6
\$\prightarrow\$c5+ 38.\$\psi\$a7 \$\prightarrow\$c7

White resigned.

Dragon Variation

Black plays 2...d6 and 5...g6

SI 154

☐ Donner
■ Spanjaard

The Netherlands 1953

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 0f6 5.0c3 g6 6.f4 0c6

The careless 6...&g771 is suspect in view of 7-c5, c.g. 7..dx6579 8.Kx65 5.g479 .&b5+, and White wins. But Black has a better defence in 7...&b5, the point being 8.g4? @xf41. After 8...&b5+ &d7 9.c61? fxc6 10...@xc6 &xc4+11.bxc3 &wc8 12...&xf7+ &xxf7 13...@xf8 &xx64+1...&xf2 &xx64+1...&xx64+1...&xf2 &xx64+1...&xf2 &xx64+1...&xx64

7.4xc6 bxc6 8.e5 dxe5?!

Better is 8...

dd7. See the game Grägger-Honfi.

9.

xd8+

xd8 10.fxe5

d5



With his king in the centre, Black is exposed to attacks by the white pieces. After 12...\$\tilde{\pme}\$e6 White can play the strong 13.0-0-0.

13.\$\tilde{\pme}\$h4 q5 14.\$\tilde{\pme}\$f2 \$\tilde{\pme}\$q7 15.0-0-0?!

15.2.d4! is more accurate.

Now everything is back on track again for White. Stronger was 15...\$\text{\$\text{\$\alpha\$}\$} 16.\$\text{\$\text{\$\alpha\$}\$} 45+\$\text{\$\text{\$\alpha\$}\$} 46, and it's not clear whether White can achieve much with 17.\$\text{\$\text{\$\alpha\$}\$} 618.\$\text{\$\text{\$\alpha\$}\$} 64.\$\text{\$\text{\$\alpha\$}\$} 16.\$\text{\$\text{\$\alpha\$}\$} 14.\$\text{\$\text{\$\alpha\$}\$} 17.\$\text{\$\text{\$\alpha\$}\$} 18.\$\text{\$\text{\$\alpha\$}\$} 18.\$\tex

Now pawn f7 remains weak, but 16...f6 17.exf6 exf6 18. ec2 is also unpleasant for Black.

17. ec2 ≝e8

Or 17...\$\psie8 18.\textbf{I}\textbf{h}f\text{ b5 19.\textbf{\textbf{b}}65+ \psife \text{bf} 8 20.\textbf{\textbf{I}}f2 \text{ \text{\texitex{\text{\texitex{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texiclex{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\texitex{\text{\texi}\text{\texit{\texit{\texit{\texi\texit{\texiclex{\texiclex{\texi{\texi}\texit{\texi}\texit{\texit{\texi}\texit{\texit{\texit{\tex{

If 20... 重xf7 then 21.重f1 wins. Very simple. 21. 重xe7+ **空xe7 22.** 重f1 Black resigned.

SI 15.5

Honfi

Budapest 1961

1.e4 c5 2.②f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.②xd4 ②f6 5.②c3 g6 6.f4 ②c6 7.②xc6 bxc6 8.e5 ③d7! 9.₩f3 9.cxd6 exd6 10.\(\overline{a}\)e3 \(\overline{o}\)f6 11.\(\overline{w}\)d2 \(\overline{a}\)g7 12.0-0-0 d5 13.\(\overline{a}\)e5 \(\overline{a}\)e6 gives Black good play, despite the fact that he can't eastle, Nunn-Miles, London 1982.

9... 0 a71

The strongest reply! 9...響b6? is met by 10.exd6 exd6 11...&e31 響xb2 12...&d4 響xa1+13.wd2 星g8 14.響xc6 星b8 15...&e6! 野h16...\$xc8, and White wins, while after 9...d5?! 10.b4! White grabs the initiative. 10...\$b1?

After 10. wxc6 Zb8 11.exd6 0-0! Black has good compensation for the sacrificed pawns.

10...0-0 11.2xc6 Ib8 12.exd6 exd6 is also worth trying. Black has compensation for his

11.泉xc6 dxe5 12.泉e3!? 基xb2 13.0-0-0 e4! 14.豐xe4

Certainly not 14. ②xe4? ₩a5, and Black wins. 14... ②xc3 15. ②xd7+ ②xd7 16. □xd7 ₩xd7 17. ₩a8+



17. Fb8!

The saving move! After 17... 響d8? 18. 響c6+ 響d7 19. 響xc3 Black might as well resign, Shaposhnikov-Bonch Osmolovsky, Soviet Union 1958.

Union 1958. 18. #xb8+ #d8 19. #xd8+ &xd8 20 @xa7 cbc7 21 &c5 Ta8 22 a3

Bad is 22.2xe7? Exa2, and it's curtains for White.

And drawn in view of 24.2f8 Ia8 25.2e7 Ia7 and a draw through move repetition.

SI 15.9

□ Basanta

Tolnai

Saint John 1988

1.e4 c5 2.ଦୀ3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.ଦxd4 ଦୀ6 5.ଦc3 g6 6.ଛିe2 ଛୁg7 7.0-0 ଦିରେ 8.ଜୁଗ୍ର 0-0 9.ଦୁb3 a6

A good alternative is 9...\$\textit{\mathbb{L}}\textit{\mathbb{e}}\textit{\mathbb{e}}. The system with \$\textit{\mathbb{L}}\textit{\mathbb{e}}\$ was briefly fashionable due to Anatoly Karpov's resounding successes with it. 10.14

After 10.a4, 10... aS is a good reaction. 10...b5 11. af3 b4 12. ad5

Taking the pawn is fine for Black. After 15.金xe7?! 互e8, 16.金xd6? is impossible in view of 16...豐b6+. Hence the text. 15...互e8 16.互e1?!

16. #c1 is a better idea, although Black has a

good position after 16...署b5. 16...皇xb2 17.温b1 皇c3 18.温xe7 温xe7 19.皇xe7 饗xa2 20.g4

A deplorable move that will later enable Black to launch his combination; but 20.2xd6 didn't work in view of 20....2f5 21. Ecl 2b2 22. Eb1 Ecs.

20... b7 21.f5?!

After 21. \$\timesxd6 \textbf{Id8} 22. \$\timesxd5 \texts 23. \$\timesxd5 \texts 24. \$\timesxd5 \texts 24. \$\timesxd5 \texts 41 \text{ with 25...15, after which he will win the endgame. The text, however, loses quickly.}

21... 響c4 22. 业xd6 What else...?

22... Id8 23. e7 Ixd5! 24. ef1

After 24. £xd5 £xd5+ 25. £g1 £d4+ the

game is over.

White resigned.

SI 15.13

☐ Bilek
■ Bachtian

Beverwijk 1966

1.e4 c5 2.କୀ3 କର୍ପର 3.d4 cxd4 4.କxd4 କ୍ରୀର 5.କର3 d6 6.ଛର4 g6?!

This is less good. There is nothing better than 6...e6.

7.6 xc6 bxc6 8.e5! 6 h5

Black cannot take on e5: 8..dxe5? 9.£xd7+, losing the queen. After the other knight move (8...2g4) 9.£f41 is good for White, e.g. 9..d5 10-£xxd5 ±d5 12.£3 2h6 13.£xa8 ₩a8 14.₩a92 2g8 15.0-0-0 h5 15.£xd5 ½g7 17.₩a5 2h6 18.₩a4+, and Black resigned in Vλyrnen-Ullrich, correspondence game 1990, as after 18...dr 8 White plays the decisive 19.£xb6 c 9...£h6 10.£xh6 2xh6 11.₩a2 2df5 12.exd6 2xd6 13.0-0-0 ₩c7 14.₩f4 0-0 15.2e4, with advantage for White, Suetin-Makarichev, Moscow 1983.

9.₩f3 e6

9...d5? is completely out of the question: 10.@xd5! cxd5 11.@xd5.

10.exd6!

10. wxc6+?! seems obvious, but after 10... 全d7 things are unclear. The text is far stronger.

10...響xd6 11.0-0 âb7 12.트d1 響b4 If 12...響c7 then 13.g4 ②g7 14.âf4, with a

large advantage for White.

Not, of course, 14... #xg5? in view of 15. #d7, and mate. But the text weakens the black position even further.

15.âe3 ⊈f7

15... ag7 is met by 16. ac5 wxc5 17. wd7+

母f8 18. 響xb7, and wins. Relatively best, but still utterly hopeless, of course, was 15... 異d8.



16 Wd7! 0c8

Or 16... £g7 17. ≜c5!, and Black might as well resign.

17. ≜ xe6+

Black resigned.

SI 16.2

☐ Alekhine ■ Botvinnik

Nottingham 1936

1.e4 c5 2.ଡ଼13 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.ଡ଼xd4 ଡ଼16 5.ଡ଼c3 g6 6.ଛe2 ଛg7 7.ଛe3 ଡ଼c6 8.ଡ଼b3 ଛe6 9.f4 0-0 10.g4 d5!?

Following the rule that action on the wing should be countered by action in the centre. But 10...\(\Delta\)a5!? 11.f5 \(\preceq\)c4, and even 10...\(\Delta\)a5!? act, and even 10...\(\Delta\)a5!? 11.f5 \(\Delta\)c4. and even 10...\(\Delta\)a5!? 11.f5

After 11.e5 Black has a strong reply in 11...d4!, Levenfish-Botvinnik, Moscow 1936

11...Ձc8

11...d4!? is also worth considering; after 12.全xd4 单d7! 13.響d2 至xd4 14.单xd4 单c6 Black is not doing badly.

12.exd5 @b4 13.d6

In later years, the possibility of 13.£f3!? gNS 14.a31 fxg4 15.£g2 ©a6 16.₩d3 was discovered. White is probably slightly better. 13...₩xd6 14.£c5

Alter 14. wxd6 exd6 15.0-0-0 gxf5 Black has no problems.



14. Wf4!

Bact is 14... wxd1+?15. axd1 ⊕c616.g5 ⊕d7 17.f6 ♠h8 18. ⊕d5. It is true that after the text White wins the b4 knight, but Black has the chance to go for perpetual check.

15.∏f1 ₩xh2 16.êxb4 @xg4! But Black must be careful. 16...₩g3+?

17.星f2 ②xg4 18.②e4! is bad. 17. ♀xg4 賞g3+ 18.星f2

White cannot avoid the perpetual: 18.\(\psi\)d2?
\(\hat{a}\) h6+, and Black wins.

18...肯g1+ 19.互f1 響g3+ 20.互f2 響g1+

SI 16.3

CITY of Stalingrad

■ CITY of Saratov

Telegraphic intercity game 1948

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 0.c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 0c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4

8.0-0 0-0 9.f4 \begin{aligned} b6! 10.e5?!

This pawn sac leads to complicated play. Despite White's success in this game, the text has a dubious reputation. 10. ₩ d2? is weak in view of 10... ♠ xe4!, and Black has won a pawn.

À better continuation is 10. ₩d31? €g4 (now 10...£xe4? is not good in view of 11.£xe6) 11.£xe5 £xd4, and now not 12.£xb6?! £xc4+13.₩h1 £xb6 – and Black is better with three pieces for the queen – but 12.£xg4! £xc3+13.₩c3 ₩c4.5 +13.₩c4 ₹xc4+14.£xc3 £xc4+15.9xc4 with equality.

10...dxe5 11.fxe5 ⊙xe5 12.⊙f5 ₩xb2! 13.⊙xe7+ ⇔h8 14.âd4 14.⊙xc8 is met by 14...₩xc3! 15.âd4 ₩xc8 16.âxe5 ≣d8, with good play for Black.



14...@q8?!

Stronger is 14...\(\mathbb{w}\)64! 15.\(\mathbb{a}\)xe5 (after 15.\(\mathbb{m}\)xe8 Black has 15...\(\mathbb{a}\)d81) 15...\(\mathbb{w}\)xe7 (18...\(\mathbb{a}\)xe7 (18...\(\

15.公b5! **₩b4**

The liquidation 15... \bigcirc f3+? 16. \blacksquare xf3 \triangleq xd4+ 17. \bigcirc xd4 \bigcirc xe7 costs Black his queen: 18. \blacksquare b3.

16.心d5 響a4 17.罩f4! g5 18.罩e4 f6

19.@xf6! @c6?!

20. û c3!

20... wa6 21.0 xh7! wb6+ 22. wh1 If5 After 22... wxh7 White wins with 23. dd3 af5 24. wh5+ ah6 25. Ie6!. 23. 0 xq5!



Black is lost; his king cannot escape the barrage from the white pieces.

23... \(\hat{\omega}\)xc3 24.\(\hat{\omega}\)h4+ \(\omega\)g7 25.\(\hat{\omega}\)h7+ \(\omega\)f8 26.\(\in\)xc3 \(\hat{\omega}\)xg5 27.\(\hat{\omega}\)h5 \(\hat{\omega}\)f5 28.\(\omega\)g4 \(\omega\)d4 29.\(\omega\)g6 \(\hat{\omega}\)66 30.\(\omega\)xe6 \(\omega\)f4 31.\(\in\)e2

Black resigned.

SI 16.5

☐ Daniliuk
■ Malakhov

Elista 1995

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 g6 3.d4 @g7 4.@c3 cxd4 5.@xd4 @c6 6.@b3 @f6 7 @e2 0-0

8.0-0 d6 9. 2 e3 2 e6 10.f4 Ic8

Good alternatives are 10...₩c8 and 10... 2a5.

Tempting. But relinquishing square e5 to the black knight will cause problems for White. After, for example, 11.\(\pm\) that 6 12.\(\pm\) f2 e5 14.\(\pm\) d2 \(\ph\) e8 the position is approximately equal. Nijboer-\(\pm\) Szalanczy.

Vienna 1990. 11...âd7 12.q4 @e5 13.@d2

After 13.204 Exc3! 14.bxc3 0xe4 15.0d2 0xd2 16.Wxd2 2x66 Black had good compensation for the exchange, Raynisky-Simagin, Moscow 1957. After 13.g5 Black had also planned 13...Exc3!: 14.gxf6 (14.bxc3 is met by 14...Exc4 again) 14...Exc3 15.xg7 dxg7, with good play for Black. White cannot make life difficult for the 63 rook.



13... Exc3!

Although Black doesn't win the e4 pawn now, the exchange sacrifice is still strong.

14.bxc3 &c6 15.&f3 ②xf3+ 16.響xf3

The point of Black's play. White will not survive the opening of the diagonal of &c6.

17. &d4

17. 2d4
17.e5 is met by 17...d4 18. \(\pi_{g3}\) dxe3 19.exf6
\(\pi_{d5}\) 20.\(\ph_{f3}\) \(\preceq_{xf6}\), and the black bishops

dominate the board.

17...dxe4 18.₩h3 @xq4!

A tine additional point of Black's play. 19. €xq7

19... \$xq7 20. 2xe4

After 20. #xg4 #xd2 the white position is a pretty sorry sight as well.

20... wb6+ 21.4 f2 axf5

And White resigned. There is no cure for 22. \$\psi h8 and 23. \$\psi g8\$.

SI 17.2

☐ Golenev

Soviet Union 1966

1.e4 c5 2.⊘f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊘xd4 4.f6 5.⊘c3 g6 6.ŵe3 ŵg7 7.f3 ⊙c6 8.∜c4 ∰b6?!

This may be playable, but it's pretty dubious. Normal is 8...0-0, transposing to the Yugo-slav Attack after 9. #d2 if White so desires. 9.6 f51?

9. \$\displays b5 has also been played here, but Black can save himself with 9... \$\mathbb{e}\$ c7 10. \$\displays d5 \$\displays d

9...考xb2 10.公xg7+ 含f8 11.公d5 公xd5 12.考xd5!?

12. \$\displaystarta xd5 has also occurred in a few games. White has compensation for his pawn, but the position is not very clear.

12...\wxa1+

An interesting possibility is the line indicated by Shashin: 12...2e6!? 13.9.xe6+ fxc6
14. wxe6 wxa1+15.xe2 wf6 16.2.h6+ xe8
17 wxf6 exf6 18.2e7 xe7 19.2xh8 xh8, wth equality. A nice way for Black to pull the stone from the white attack!

13.√f2 **₩f6?**

A logical move, but not a good one! After 13. ₩xg7! White plays 14. 2h6, of course,



17.@c7?!

The correct move in the wrong order! Correct is 17.£d11, transposing to the game after 17...£c6 18.£c7 IE88 19.Exd6t. In the correspondence game Bratsev-Dragunov. 1967/68, Black played 17...£c6, followed by the beautiful sequence 18.5d6+1 ext6 19.Exd4 Ed82 20.24 IE82 12.£b3 Ed82 22.£d5 52 32.Ed3 a5 24.h5 f5 25.Ed3 IE68 26.gxf5 gxf5 27.exf5 Exd 28.£c6 Exc2+ 29.½g5 IEG7 30.44 Exc6 31.£xc6+ IE77 32.f5 b4 33.f6 a434.£g7, and Black resigned.

A magnificent garrotte! 17... ■b8 18. ■d1 ②c6?

Now White can successfully round off his combination. After 18...b5! the outcome is by no means clear.

19.\\xd6! exd6

After 19... 2c6 White has 20. 2xe6!. 20. 4 e8

And Black resigned, as he will be mated on the next move

SI 17 4

□ Volchok ■ Grobde

Correspondence game 1997

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 @f6 5.@c3 q6 6.@e3 @q7 7.f3 @c6 8. #d2 0-0 9.0-0-0 d5 10. \$b1!?

A move that is less innocent than it looks 10 @vd4

10...dxe4? is bad in view of 11 €xe6 ₩xd2 12. 2xe7+. and White wins a piece, 10...e5?! is met by 11.0xc6 bxc6 12.exd5 exd5 13.@xd5 - with the g7-b2 diagonal closed, White is running fewer risks than in the variation we will see in the games under SI 17.5. 11.e5!?

The point of 10.\$b1, although it would go too far to say that this move gives White an advantage.

11...@xf3

Black's strongest reply is probably 11... 2f5!?. followed by 12 exf6 @xf6 13 @xd5 \wxd5! 14.響xd5のxe3 15 響d2のxd1 16 響xd1 ae6 and the position is unclear. Black has a rook and a bishop for the queen and his bishops are very active. Practice has shown that chances are approximately equal. An example is Volchok-Lecrog, correspondence game 1998/99-17.@d3 IIfd8 18 h4 IId6 19 h5 IIb6 20 h3 a5 21.hxg6 hxg6 22.實g1 国d6 23.實e3 国ad8 24. Idl a4 25.g4 axb3 26.cxb3 b5 27. We2 @c4! 28.bxc4 bxc4 29.@c2 Eb8+ 30.@b3 cxb3 31. Exd6, and a draw was agreed.

12.axf3 @d7

The continuation 12 @h5 13 @xd5 @e6 14 f4 響xd5 15 響xd5 êxd5 16 買xd5 êb6 17. \(\hat{\omega}\)c4 \(\hat{\omega}\)xf4 \(20.b3! b5 21.exb5 其c5 22.a4 耳xe5 23.耳hd1 was seen in two other correspondence games by Volchok. White has compensation for the pawn he is down

13.€ xd5 € xe5

13...@xe5? costs Black the exchange: 14.@f6+

14.@h3! @d6

14...e6?! is met by 15.kg5, while after 14... £g7?! White plays 15. £c5, in both cases with advantage for White.

15 9 h6 Te8?

Now Black is out of it. He should have sacrificed the exchange; 15...@b6!? 16.@xb6 axb6 20.h4 \u22a8c7, and White's advantage was not very clear, Volchok-Johnson, correspondence game 1996/99.

16. The1 4\c5

Or 16... ab6 17. af6+! exf6 18. 其xe8+ 費xe8 19 wxd6 @e6 20 @xe6 fxe6 (20 wxe6 21. 賞d8+ 賞e8 22. 賞xf6) 21. 賞c7 賞f7 22. 48+, and it's curtains, or 16. 6e5 17 f4 @g4 18. @xg4 @xg4 19. @f6+ exf6 20 #xe8+ wxe8 21. wxd6 \(\hat{\omega}\)e6 22.f5!, winning, Variations by Volchok

17. Wc3 e5

20. ₩c4 Φh8

17...f6 is met by 18. 2xf6+! exf6 19. \(\maxrta{}\)xd6!. and White wins

18 f4 f6

Otherwise White plays 19 @ 05 19.f5! g5 Black has to keep his position closed.



21.4 xf6!

A nice winning move! 21... wxf6 22. Exd6! @e4 The only option: after 22... 對xd6 23. 對f7 耳o8 24 f6 Black is mated

23 Exf6 @d2+ 24. cc1 @xc4 25.b3 @b6 26 Tye5

Black might as well have resigned here. 26...@d7 27. Exe8+ Exe8 28. @xq5 @q7 29. #d6

Nicer and quicker was 29. Exb6 axb6 30.f6+ \$\psi_e6 31.\(\hat{\omega}\)xd7 \$\pm\$d8 32.f7! \$\pm\$xg5 33.\(\hat{\omega}\)e8, ac-

cording to Volchok himself. 29...\$17 30.\(\mathbb{I}\)h6 \(\phi\)q8 31.f6 \(\mathbb{L}\)xh3 32. Exh3 Ee2 33. 2d2 Ef2 34. Eq3+ 2f7 35. #g7+ wxf6 36. #xh7

Black resigned.

SI 17.5

Tolnai

■ Perenyi Budapest 1981

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 4 f6 5.4 c3 q6 6.4 e3 4 q7 7.f3 0-0 8. #d2 @c6 9.0-0-0 d5 10.exd5 @xd5 11.0 xc6 bxc6 12.0 xd5

This move is of fundamental importance for the entire variation. Can White take the proffered pawn or not? This is still not clear.

12 cvd5 13 wvd5 wc7 14 wc5 After 14.響xa8 &f5 15.響xf8+ 由xf8 16.單d2

h5 the books say that Black's prospects are slightly better.

14 Wh7 15 @d421

It is obvious that White wants to neutralise. the influence of \$27, yet the text is not the best way to go about it. 15.響b5?! 響xb5 16 0 xb5 \$\mathbb{\pi}\$b8 is also good for Black. One possibility is 15.響a3!?, e.g. 15....全f5 16. a6 ₩c7 17, ₩c5 ₩b6 18, ₩xb6 axb6 19. Qc4 □tr-8-20 命b3 〒xa21-21 〒d8+ 〒xd8-22 命xa2 with an approximately equal endgame.

For 15.b3, see the game Psakhis-David. 15...@f5 16.@d3

After 16 衛b5 衛c7 17 衛e2 (17 衛c5? is met. by the ingenious 17...實f4+ 18.全e3 賢a4

19. wc4 wa5 20. wd5 Ifc8!, and the attack strikes home. Schöne-Becher. Germany 1959) the long variation 17... Ifc8 18.c4 響f4+ 19. 衛d2 总h6 20.g3 管xd4! 21. 管xh6 罩xc4+! 22 @xc4 wxc4+23 dod2 Td8+24 doc3 wc5+ 25 cbe2 wh5+26 cbe3 we5+27 cbf2 wxh2+ 28.由e3 實a3+ 29.由e2 實a6+ 30.由e3 實e6+ 31.4f2 \mathbb{\mathbb{m}} xa2+ leads to a good endgame for Black, Marton-Rigo, Budapest 1982.

16 響 a3 響 c7 17 章 c3 響 f4+! 18 章 d2 響 d4 19 &c3 響e3+20 deb1 耳fc8 is also quite annoving for White.

16... #fc8 17. #a3 @xd4 18. @xf5



18 Tc3! 19 @e4

After 19.bxc3 White is completely cornered by 19...@e3+ 20.\dag{2}d2 gxf5 21.c4 f4.

19... wb6 20. wxe7

wine

Now 20.bxc3 is met by 20... de3+ 21. Id2 面b8 22 響b3 @xd2+ 23 @xd2 響f2+ and

20... Exc2+! 21. exc2

Or 21. axc2 實xb2+ 22. ad3 質c3+ 23. ae2 ₩e3+, and mate. 21... wxb2+ 22. 0d2 wc3+ 23. 0c1 Ic8

24 We4 Or 24 Td2 Wal mate

24... wa3+ 25. ad2 Exc2+! 26. ae1 Or 26. acc2 響c3+, and mate: or 26. 響xc2

₩e3 mate. 26...@c3+

White resigned.

SI 175

☐ Psakhis
■ David

Andorra 1996

1.e4 c5 2.\(\text{0.c3}\) d6 3.\(\text{0.f3}\) \(\text{0.f6}\) 4.d4 cxd4 5.\(\text{0.xd4}\) g6 6.\(\text{0.e3}\) \(\text{0.g7}\) 7.f3 0-0 8.\(\text{w}\) d2 \(\text{0.c6}\) 9.0-0-0 d5 10.exd5 \(\text{0.xd5}\) 10.\(\text{0.xd5}\) 13.\(\text{w}\) xd5 \(\text{w}\) c7 15.\(\text{0.xd5}\) \(\text{0.xd5}\) 15.\(\text{0.xd5}\) 16.\(\text{0.xd5}\)

After 16.急c4?! 且ac8 17.审估5 且xc4! 18.歡xc4 且c8 19.急c5 h5 Black has good compensation for the material he has lost. 16...耳ac8



17. wa5

17... \(\bar{L} \) c3 18.\(\alpha \) xf5 \(\bar{L} \) xe3 19.\(\alpha \) e4 \(\bar{W} \) b8 20.g3 \(\bar{W} \) c8 21.g4 \(\bar{L} \) e2

Another option is 21... wb8!?. In the correspondence game Klauner-Qwint, 1995, there followed 22. wg5 wb6! 23. ad7?! (after

23.豐xe7 豐a5 Black has the usual compensation in this line) 23... 且e2 24. 也d1 里xh2, with advantage for Black.

22.h4 wb8 23.g5?!

This move won't trouble Black. Stronger is 23.4b1, when Black hangs on to his compensation with 23 He8 or 23 Hb2

23... 互内2! 24. 互xh2 wxh2 25. wxa7!? wf4+ 26. 会b1 we5 27. 会c1 wf4+ 28. 会b1 we5 29. 会c1 Draw.

SI 17.5

☐ Adams

■ Fedorov Wilk san Zee 2001

1.e4 c5 2.④f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.④xd4 ⑤f6 5.④c3 g6 6.彙e3 彙g7 7.f3 △c6 8.變d2 0-0 9.0-0-0 d5 10.exd5 ④xd5 11.④xc6 bxc6 12.④xd5 cxd5 13.變xd5 變c7 14.變c5 變b8

For 14... \$\mathbb{w}\$ b7, see the previous games Tolnai-Perenyi and Psakhis-David.

15.₩a3



15.b3 could be followed by 15...\$\hat{2}f5 16.\hat{2}d3 \\
\hat{1}c8 17.\hat{2}a5 \\
\hat{1}c3 18.\hat{2}xf5 \\
\hat{2}xe3 19.\hat{2}c4 \\
\hat{2}f2 19.\hat{2}c4 \\
\hat{2}f3 19.\hat{2}c4 \\
\hat{2}f3

1999, White went 20,2xa8?!, and now Black missed the strongest continuation: 20. ±fd.3+l, and after 21.3b lt \(\frac{1}{2} \) \(\frac{1}

15....2e6 16.2a6 web

Maybe 19. ac7, as played in the game Kosanovic-Rajlich, Budapest 2001, deserves cloter examination.

19 0f5



20. #xd8

20... Exd8 21.c3?!

This is not good. After 21. ac4 Fedorov has indicated 21... ac8, but this isn't very clear: 22. Are7! afte 3.arf7 axa3 24. axf6+ axc4 25.bxa3 axc2+ 26. acd axc4 axf6+ axc4 threatening axf6) 27.e4.

21... wb6 22. e3 eh6! 23.f4

This is a fatal weakening of White's position,

but there was nothing better; after 23.2xh6?

23 Wc6 24 od2

24...\d5 25.\deltae2 e5! 26.\ddaya4 exf4 27.qxf4?

Relatively best was 27. Ie8+, although 27. IE8+ although 28- although 2

Or 28. \$\partial xf4 \pi h1+; or 28. \$\pi xf4 \pi xa2. 28. \$\pi n7 29. \$\pi xf4\$

Or 29. axd8 âxd2+.

29... 三xe8 30. 全c4 響h1+ 31. 全f1 安g8! Black still has to be careful: 31... 全h3? 32. 響h6+, or 31... 全d3? 32. 響d4+.

And after this move White resigned.

SI 17.5

☐ Kuijf ■ Rechlis

recinis

Beer Sheva 1987

1.e4 c5 2.©13 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.©xd4 ②16 5.©c3 g6 6.@e3 @g7 7.f3 0-0 8.₩d2 ②c6 9.0-0-0 d5 10.exd5 ②xd5 11.©xc6 bxc6 12.©xd5 cxd5 13.@16

Also an idea. White spurns the pawn and continues his own attack. But this plan is not very dangerous for Black.

13...⊈xh6 14.₩xh6 ₩a5 15.⇔b1 e5

16.h4 Xb8 17.h5

Safer is 17.皇d3!?, e.g. 17...e4!? 18.fxe4 皇g4 (18...實b4 19.b3 dxe4 20.皇e2 饗c5 21.b5 g5 is slightly unclear, but is probably equal. Podlesnik-Justin, Yugoslavia 1989) 19. Idel ■xb2+ 20.\$xb2 ■b8+ 21.\$c1 響a3+ 22. \$\d2 d4 23. \$\dagger f4, and a draw was agreed in view of the perpetual that Black now has Lepelletier-Hausrath, Hania 1994

17....@f5 18.@d3

After 18.g4? Black smashes the white king position with sacrifices: 18...@xc2+! 19.\$\psixc2 \pm xb2+! 20.\$\psixb2 \pm b8+ 21 \$\psic^2\$ ₩xa2+ 22 obd3 Eh3 mate

18...e4 19.hxq6?!

Now White has blown his chances on the kingside. Better is 19.fxe4 #c3 20. #c1 dxe4 21. £e2 #fc8 22.g4, with an unclear battle. Spangenberg-Escobar, Buenos Aires 1990 19...@xq6!

Now the black king position is sufficiently safeguarded, and Black can concentrate on his own actions on the other wing

20. 2e2 耳fc8 21. ₩e3?!

21. #d2 may be a better way to stop the black attack

21...IIc3!

Less clear is 21...exf3?! 22.2d3, e.g. 22...fxg2 23.皇xg6 gxh1響 24.異xh1. 22. Wd4 Wa3 23.b3



23 Exc21

With 2g6 glowering threateningly in the distance, this sacrifice is not so difficult to find! 24. exc2 #xa2+ 25 #h2

Or 25 sbc1 Wxh3

25...e3+! 26.dc1 Ic8+ 27. ac4 Ixc4+ White resigned. After 28 bxc4 \wxc4+ it is curtains

SI 17.6

☐ Groeneveld ■ Di Palma

Correspondence game 1990

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 q6 6.≗e3 ≗q7 7.f3 @c6 8. #d2 0-0 9.0-0-0 d5 10.exd5 @xd5 11.@xc6 bxc6 12.@d4

With this much-played move White sidestens the complications arising after taking the pawn with 12 40xd5

12...e5 13. £c5 £e6!? 14. 6e4

Accepting the exchange sac with 14. 2xf8?! is risky. After 14... wxf8 15 ab1 Tb8 Black has good compensation. An example is 16. 2xd5 (Black was already threatening 16...e4) 16...cxd5 17.\u00eda5 e4 18.b3 \u00edee7 19.fxe4 dxe4 20.c3 Ic8 21.Ic1 Ic5 22. Wb4 響c7 23.êa6 (or 23.\$b2 a5) 23.êxc3. 24.響b7 e3, and Black is winning, Kern-Boudignon, correspondence game 1995.

14... Eb8 15.c4

Other moves are 15.h4 and 15.ac4. I have to refer the reader to what the books have to say on this subject

15... Wc7 16 @ vf821

This is still highly dangerous, But 16.0g5 can be met strongly by 16 ... e4! and 18 cxd5? fails to 18... \$ h6! after 16. \$ d6 \@b6.17. \$ vb8. Exb8. In this variation a better option for White is to play 17.c5 \bigwip b7 18.\text{\text{\text{\text{2}}} xf8 \text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{17}}}}} 19.@d6. but after 19...@xd6 20.cxd6 @b4 Black again has compensation for the exchange.

16.... xf8 17.cxd5

After 17. 公b1 全b4 18. 衛d3 公f4 19. 衛c2 全f5 Black has good compensation; he will have to continue with @f4-e6-d4 17 cvd5+ 18 wc3

18.4/bl is met by 18...dxe4 19.fxe4 &b4, followed by 20... #a5.

18... we7 19. wxe5

The main threat was 19 IIc8 19 Tc8+ 20 @c3

White is a full rook up, but he should fear for his life!

20 @h6+!

A very strong move! Less clear is 20...\$27?! 21. 實f4 實c5 22. 全d2 實b6 23. 全e1 實xb2 24 9 e2 Ec4. 21.f4

This is forced, as 21. \$b1? costs the queen in view of 21... £f5+, while after 21. ad2 Black has 21...d4 22.實xd4 單d8. 21...ûa7 22.₩e3

The move Wf4 from the variation given under

Black's 20th move is not possible now! 22. Wh4 23. Id3 d4 24.a3 Wa4! 25 We42

Now White will soon have to throw in the towel. But even after 25. md2 dxc3 26. ad8+ #xd8 27. 響xd8+ 全f8 28.bxc3 響xa3+ Black still has a strong attack.

25 ... \$ f5 26. \$b1

After 26 Wb7 dxc3 27 Wxc8+ @xc8 28 IId8+ ... (X 29 買vcX Wyf4+ it is also finished 26... Exc3

White resigned.

SI 17.6

□ Tiviakov Ernst, Thomas

Gausdal 1992

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 @f6 5.@c3 g6 6.@e3 @g7 7.f3 @c6 8 Wd2 0-0 9.0-0-0 d5 10.exd5 0xd5 11 @xc6 bxc6 12 @d4 e5 13 @c5 IIe8 Interesting and possibly stronger is 13... &e6. See the game Groeneveld-Di Palma.

14.4 e4

With 14 公xd5!? cxd5 15 實xd5 質xd5 16 Exd5 White can still win the nawn. Black then plays 16... &c6, but after 17. \(\bar{2}\) d6 &xa2 18.b4! (stronger than 18.b3 Ecc8 19.Ed5 a5! 20. \$\dag{a}\$b2 a4 21.\$\dag{a}\$xa2 axb3++ 22.\$\dag{a}\$xb3 国a5 23. ac4. draw. Tisdall-Keene. Aarhus 1983) it is anything but plain sailing, e.g. 18...a5 19 @b5 | Hec8 20 @d7 | Hc7 21 @c6 | Hac8 22.b5 &f8 23. \(\bar{L}\) hd1 &xd6 24. \(\bar{L}\) xd6, and despite the exchange, Black's position is not great, Kruppa-Tiviakov, Kherson 1991.

14...f5 15.@d6 @f8



16.4 xe8

Another option is 16. \$b5!?, e.g. 16...\$d7 17.耳he1 耳e6 18.分b7 響c7 19.章a6 章c8 20 @xf8 @xb7 21 @xb7 @xb7 22 @a3 實a6 23. ab1 ac8, with approximate equality, Georgiev-Alterman, Burgas 1995, Complicated!

16... axc5 17.c4 where

After 17...f4 18.4b1 &f5+ 19.4d3 @e3 20. axf5 公xd1 21. axd1 wxd2 22. axd2 gxf5 23. ©c7 Ec8 24. Ed7 White is slightly better. according an analysis by Tiviakov.

18.\$b1 @e3

18... ab4 was worth considering as well; 19. Wh6 is met by 19... £f8. Again extremely complicated!

19 @ f6+

Very good for Black is 19. Ie1?! Ae6 20. © f6+ gg7 21. © d7 & xd7 22. 實 xd7+ gh6. 19....\$f8

19... \$g7 may be met by 20.€d7 &xd7 21. 響xd7+ 如h6 22. 其d2! 如h4 23. 其d3 のxc4 24.f4 @a3+! 25.wal @c2+ 26.wb1 @a3+. and a draw. Again according to the analysis by Tiviakov.

20. Wd7

After 20.\(\beta\)e1 f4 21.\(\beta\)d7 \(\oldsymbol{\oldsymbol{\oldsymbol{2}}}{\oldsymbol{2}}\)e2.\(\oldsymbol{\oldsymbol{2}}{\oldsymbol{2}}\)e3.\(\oldsymbol{\oldsymbol{2}}{\oldsymbol{2}}\) \$e7 23.@xb6 axb6 Black's strong knight on @e3 should give him good compensation for the exchange.

20...@xd1 21.@xh7+ @q8 22.@f6+ @f8 23.6 h7+

And a draw was agreed. Food for hours of analysis!

SI 17 7

Fiore ■ Petrillo

Correspondence game 1991

1.e4 c5 2.013 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0 xd4 @f6 5.@c3 q6 6.@e3 @q7 7.f3 0-0 8. #d2 @c6 9.g4 @e6 10.0-0-0 @xd4 11. 2xd4 #a5 12.a3 Eab8 13.h4 Efc8 A good idea is 13...b5!? at once. After 14.h5?! b4 Black's attack is one move quicker than in the game, e.g. 15. ad5 (or 15. ab1 Ifc8 16.hxg6 fxg6, with a black attack) 15... axd516.exd5 要xd517.axb4 要a218.c3 Ifc8 19.hxg6 hxg6 20.b5 e5 21.@f2 e4 22. Ad4 @d5, and Black wins. Tonning-Reschke, Groningen 1995 23 @xo7 fails to 23... #al+ 24. \$c2 4b4+ 25. \$b3 ₩a2+ 26. \$\pixb4 a5 mate!

The most solid reply to 13...b5!? is 14.4d5. with a swap and an approximately equal position: 14... #xd2+ 15. Exd2 @xd5 16.exd5 14.h5 b5 15.hxq6 b4 16.6 d5

A possibility is 16.gxh7+ \$\preceph\$h8, and now 17. ab1!? looks like a tough nut to crack. How is Black going to get through?

16... £xd5 17.q5!?



17 Wa42

This is refuted, and 17...e5? is also bad: 18.gxf6 @xf6 19.gxh7+ @h8 20.Eg1 exd4 21. 實h6 基xc2+ 22. axc2 實a4+ 23. ad2 ae5 24. £b5!, and Black resigned, S. Polgar-Lindemann, Vienna 1991. The point is 24... wxb5 25. 国g8+ 国xg8 26.hxg8w++ \$xg8 27. \(\bar{2}\)g1+, and mate. Correct is 17...@xe4!, e.g. 18.gxh7+ @h8

19. axg7+ axg7 20. ad4+ e5 21. axd5 ₩xd5 22. Exd5 @g3 23. Eg1 @xf1 24. Exf1 bxa3 25.bxa3, with an equal endgame, Haese-Weber, correspondence game 1995 18.gxf6 exf6 19.gxh7+ &h8 20.2b5!

The same trick as in Polgar-Lindemann! The text gains a tempo to get the d-rook to the g-file.

20...\wxb5

After 20... 基xb5 21. 基dg1 bxa3 22. 實g2 муh2+ 23 @xh2 Дхс2+ 24. #xc2 Дс5 25. 要xc5 dxc5 26. 里xg7 it is also finished.

21 exd5 @xd5

Or 21...bxa3 22.豐g2 axb2+ (22... 基xc2+ 23.如xc2 響xb2+ 24.毫xb2 里xb2+ 25.如d3 ■xg2 26. ac1) 23. ab1 響a4 24. 響xg7+ axg7 25 Ede1+ 如f8 26.h8費+, and mate. 22. #da1 Wxf3

22... #a2 is met by 23. #g2, and Black might as well resign.

23.axb4

Now White calmly takes the pawn. 23... II e8 24. II h2

Black resigned; there is no cure for 25. Hhg2.

SI 17 7

☐ Plaskett ■ Watson

Brighton 1983

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 ♦ f6 5.40c3 q6 6.4e3 4q7 7.f3 0-0 8. #d2 @c6 9.q4 @e6 10.0-0-0 @xd4 11. 0 xd4 Wa5 12.a3 Ifc8 13.h4 Iab8 14 h5 b5 15.h6

For 15.hxg6, see the game Fiore-Petrillo.



15 h4!?

The aim of White's previous move was 15...&h8 16.@d5. and after the inevitable swap White is slightly better. But the bizarre 15... £f8!? 16. £xf6 b4!, suggested by Hungarian Dragon experts Schneider and Sapi, may be worth considering.

16.hxq7?!

Very bad is 16.axb4? in view of 16... wal+ £f8 is also very good for Black. A better option is 16. 4b5!?; after 16... xb5

17. axb5 響xb5 18.hxg7 bxa3 19.響d3 the position is unclear.

16...bxa3 17.wh6?!

An obvious move. What can Black do against the threat 18.2xf6 and 19. wxh7 mate? But 17. 65!? was another possibility now: 17... 基xb5 18. âxb5 實xb5 19. 數d3, transposing to the comment to move 16.

17...axb2+ 18. d2 axq4! And White is brought back to earth with a

19 9 xf6

After 19.fxg4 e5! it's all over. 19...£h5!

The threat of mate on h7 has gone. Now it's Black's turn on the other side. Suddenly Whi-

te is beyond saving. 20. û d4

Other moves won't solve White's problems either, e.g. 20.2h3 exf6 21.2xc8 Exc8 22. 實e3 實b4, or 20. 其xh5 實xh5 21. 豐xh5 oxh5 or 20.4d3 (maybe his toughest defence) 20. b1 # 21. Exbl Exbl 22. 2xb1 exf6 23.c4 f5! 24. ac3 ₩c5, and White's position remains very awkward - Black has at least good compensation for his piece.

20...e5! 21. Exh5 gxh5 22. ga5 gb4 23. gd3 wxd4 24. d5 wf2+ 25. e2 耳xc2+! 26.含xc2 質xe2+ 27.含c3 質xf3+ 28. cc4

Or 28. 占d2 實xd1+29. 占xd1 b1實+. 28 Wh3+

White resigned.

☐ Ostermever

■ Sosonko

Mannheim 1975

1.e4 c5 2.413 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.6xd4 @f6 5.@c3 q6 6.@e3 @g7 7.f3 @c6 11. cb1 wc7

The point of 11. 含b1 is that 11...響a5? is met strongly by 12.@d5!; after 12...\wxd2 White has the intermediate move 13.@xe7+, winning a pawn

12.g4 Ifc8 13.h4 Wa5 14.a3

For the alternative 14. #g5, see the game Ernst-Van de Mortel

14... Eab8 15.h5 b5 16.h6

White cannot really continue his attack, as 16.hxg6 hxg6 17.\dot{\dot{w}}h2? is met simply by 17...b4 - the black attack rolls on and White cannot harm the black king. But the liquidation 16.包d5 響xd2 17. Ixd2 包xd5 18. axg7 ±xg7 19.exd5 leads to an equal position.

16....@h8



17. 9 xf6?

This is refuted. 17.g5?! is less good as well, as Black can react strongly with 17...b4! e.g. 18. 6b5 (bad is 18.gxf6? bxc3 19. 6xc3 耳xc3 20.b3 (20.b4 @a2+!) 20...@xb3!, with good

chances for Black. With 17.@d5! could still have pulled the emergency break; after 17... wxd2 18. 基xd2 he still has a quite playable position.

17... 2xf6 18.0d5 h41

White had intended 18... wxd2? 19.6xf6+ exf6 20. axd2, of course, and he is positionally winning. But the text gives Black a lightning attack.

19.axb4

19. £xb4 is met by 19... £c3! 20.bxc3 ₩xa3 and after 19, axf6+ exf6 White has no defence against 20... Wa4.

19 Wa4 20 h5

Or 20.c3 axd5 21.exd5 axc3 22.bxc3 費b3+. 20... 9xd5 21.exd5 a6!

White resigned. There's no remedy against 22. axb5 and 23. Ta8.

SI 17.8

☐ Ernst, Sipke ■ Van de Mortel

Groningen 1995

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 q6 6.@e3 @g7 7.f3 0-0 8. # d2 @c6 9.0-0-0 @xd4 10. @xd4 @e6 11.db1 賞c7 12.g4 트fc8 13.h4 賞a5 14. 审q5 审c7

The endgame after 14... wxg5?! 15.hxg5 @d7 16. ≜xg7 \$xg7 17. \$\pi\text{4} is good for White 15. gd2

After 15.h5?! h6 16.\dd2 g5 the kingside remains closed.

15... #a5 16. #q5 b5!?

Rather than accepting move repetition, Black sacrifices a pawn.

17. 資xb5

This is forced, really, as 17.h5? is refuted by 17... Exc3! 18. exc3 響xa2+ 19. 中c1 h4 20. 2d4 (20. 2xb4 2xe4!) 20. 2xg4! 21.2xf6 (21.fxg4 @xe4 is also curtains) 21... axf6 22. 實 xg4 ac3!, and White is mated.

17... @ c7 18. Wa4 Zab8



19. 0.a6

Now things look bad for White, but it is not very clear what else he should play. After 19.55? @d7 20.@b5 @b7 21.hxg6 hxg6 22. 實xa7 皇xb5 Black wins a piece, while after 19. 9.55 @xe4!? 20.fxe4? (20. @xg7!? looks like a tougher nut to crack) 20...@xd4 21 耳xd4 a6 22. 對xa6 耳a8 23. 對c6 對b8 White loses his queen! 19. wxa7 Ib7 20. wa4 id7.21 響a3.e5.22. @a6.exd4.23.@xb7 響xb7 24 Evd4 @xe41 25 @xe4 @xd4 26.@xd6 ±xb2! 27 ₩xb2 ₩xf3 should also favour Black: the white king is not very safe and the white pieces are scattered across the board. 19 that is strongly met by 19... #b7!?, e.g. 20 用bl 響b4! 21 響xb4 耳xb4 22.毫e3 (or 22. 4xa7 @xe4! 23.@xe4 Exc2, with dire threats) 22 @xe4! with winning threats. These lines are taken from Chris Ward's extensive analysis in his book Winning with the Swilian Dragon 2. A warning for the reader: Ward emphatically calls his variations just 'a starting-point for your own investigations'!

19 @d7 20 Wa3

Atter 20.9 b5 @xb5 21.@xb5 @xb5! ご #xb5 | wxc2+ 23. wal @xe4 24.fxe4 124 @xe7 @f2) 24...@xd4 Black has good compensation for the exchange.

20 @xe4 21. 9 xc8?!

This is too much for the white position. It was

time to go for an equal endgame with 21.fxe4 oxd4 22 耳xd4 響xc3 23 響xc3 耳xc3 24.e5!. 21 2 xd4



22.fxe4

And here 22 @xe4 (or even 22.@d5) is also good for Black; 25. 中c1 實xc8.

22... a xc3 23. a xd7 a xb2 24. wa4 After 24 響xb2 厚xb2+ 25.\$xb2 響xd7 the endoame with all these loose pawns, looks suspiciously bad for White.

24 9e5+25.9b5 Or 25. cc1 &f4+ 26. Ed2 Wc3. 25... #c3 26. #c1 a6 27. #df1 #xb5 28. cbd1

Otherwise 26. #b1+ and mate. 28 We3 29 Wd4 Instead of resigning.

29...Ib1 Mate.

SI 17 9

☐ Evans ■ Zuckerman

New York 1966/67

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 q6 6.@e3 @c6 7.f3 @g7 8 WH2 0-0 9 0-0-0 @xd4 10. @xd4 @e6

11.ab1 賞c7 12.h4 至fc8

12...h5?! cannot prevent the h-file from being opened, as White plays 13,g4! hxg4 14.h5!, and the white attack rolls on. There is remarkably little theory about this.

13.h5 @xh5?

This is a fatal error. Stronger is 13... as 5 14.hxg6 hxg6 15.a3 asb 16...act3 &c44; and Black has counterplay. The liquidation 17...axf6 &xf6 18...c45 sexd2 19.6xf6+ yields White no advange; 19...acp17.02.h5+ gxh5 21...axd2 &xd3 22.cxd3 &g6, with a roughly equal endgame. Van der Wiel-Reinderman, Dutch championship 1995.

14. 2xg7 ±xg7 15.g4 2f6 16. ₩h6+ ±g8



17.e5!

An important pawn sacrifice. \(\hat{L}\)d3 will need a free diagonal.

17...dxe5 18.g5 @h5 19.@d3!

19. \(\pi xh5! \) gxh5 20. \(\pi d3 \) leads to the same outcome.

19...e4

This can't save Black, nor can 19...f5 20.基xh5 gxh5 21.黉e6+.

20.基xh5 gxh5 21.④xe4 響f4 Or 21...全f5 22.④f6+, and mate.

22.②f6+! exf6 23.≗xh7+ &h8 24.≗f5+ &g8 25.₩h7+ &f8 26.₩h8+

Black resigned in view of 26... \$27.gxf6 mate.

SI 18 4

☐ Karpov

■ Gik

Moscow 1968

1.e4 c5 2.013 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 0.f6 5.0c3 g6 6.2e3 2eg7 7.f3 0-0 8.2c4 0.c6 9.wd2 wa5 10.0-0-0 2ed7 11.h4 0.e5 12.b3 Efc8 13.h5 0xh5 14.2h6 0xh6

The theory books give the spectacular line 14... 企动+!? 15... ф b) (15... ф a) & skh+: 15... ф a) (15... ф a) & skh+: 17... ф

15. Wyh6 Eye3!

The standard exchange sacrifice in this kind of position.

16.bxc3 \mathbb{\pi}xc3?!

17. ⊕e2 ₩c5 18.g4 ⊕f6 18... ⊕g4? 19.fg4 ⊕g4 fails to 20. ⊕f7!



20.\(\mathbb{Z}\xh5!\)

And this is a standard exchange sacrifice on White's part!

The knight move 20.€g3?! looks strong, but then 20..£g4! is a good reply for Black, e.g. 121.55 (21.154) 20.154 bess the quenty 121...0xf5 22.exf5 €c4 23.≜xc4 ₩xc4 (24.£xh5 ₩f4+25.\$bl gxh5, with advantage for Black, Yco-D'Costa, St.Helier 1999)

for Black, Yeo-D'Costa, St.Heller 1999. 20...gxh5 21.量h1 營e3+ 22.令b1 營xf3 After 22...營xe2 23.營xh5 White has a simple

After 22...響xe2 23.響xh5 White has a simple win: 23...e6 24.響xh7+ 空f8 25.響h8+ 空e7 26.響f6+, and Black will soon be mated. 23.耳xh5 e6?

Now White can win by force. More stubborn is 33...266, when Golubev has indicated the line 24.₩xh7+ chf8 25. Bh1! c6 26.0d4 ₩f4 (if 26...₩x64², then 27. Bi1 wins) 27. Chf № 5 28.0xd6! ₩g7 (or 28...₩xd6 29. Bi1 chf8 30. ₩xg6, with advantage) 29. 2xb7. White is better, but there is still a long way to

24.g6! @xg6

Or 24...fxg6 25.\\xi\xh7+ \&f8 26.\\xi\h8+ \&e7 27.\\xi\h7+.

25.₩xh7+ \$f8 26.星f5! ₩xb3+

The only way. Karpov finishes his opponent off smoothly in the way we are accustomed to seeing from him.

27.axb3 exf5 28.心f4! 且d8 Or 28. 公xf4 29.營h8+.

29. %h6+ &e8 30. \(\times \) xg6 fxg6 31. \(\times \) xg6+ \(\times \) e7 32. \(\times \) g5+ \(\times \) e8 33. \(\times \) \$\\ \times \) \$\\ 34. \(\times \) g8+ \(\times \) e7 35. \(\times \) g7+ \(\times \) d8 36. f6

Black resigned.

SI 18.5

☐ Orlov ■ Golubev

Odessa 1982

1.e4 c5 2.013 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 16 5.0c3 g6 6.ee3 eg7 7.f3 0-0 8.\d2 0c6 9.ec4 ed7 10.h4 Ec8 11.eb3 0e5 12.h5 0xh5 13.0-0-0 \daggers

For the weaker 16...\\xixxc3?!, see the game Karpov-Gik

17. 2e2 2f6 18. 2b1 2b5 19. 2f4 2c4



20.q4!

20...₩xc3

21.g5

White has no choice but to accept the draw: 21. △2d57 is bad in view of 21. ... △xd5 22. Ixd5 ■x3 23.95 △h5 24. Igg1 ○g4 25. It5 ■xf5 26.exf5 ○xh6 27. gxh6 №f8. with a winning position for Black, Boeykens-Le Quang, Belgium 1995.

21.... 2xb3 22.cxb3 ₩c2+

Draw.

SI 18.5

□ Tal ■ Wade

Palma de Mallorca 1966

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 @f6 5.@c3 q6 6.@e3 @q7 7.f3 @c6 8. #d2 0-0 9. ac4 ad7 10.h4 #c8 11.2b3 wa5 12.h5 @xh5 13.g4 @f6 14.0-0-0 @e5 15.@h6 @xh6

15... Exc3!?, without taking on h6, is another possibility. 16.Xxh6!?

After 16. wxh6 Black would surely also have played 16 Txc3

16. Exc3!? 17 byc3

Practice has shown that the endgame after the queen swap 17.\perpen xc3 \perpen xc3 18,bxc3 is good for Black. He has at least a pawn for the exchange, and the white pawn formation is badly weakened

17... #c8 18 doh2 h52

This is bad. As it turns out. White needs only a few moves to crash through Black's kingside defences. Correct is 18... #b6!, with the threat 19...@c4+, and move renetition is looming: 19.\$c1 營c5 20.\$b2.

19. Idh1 @c4+ 20. 2xc4 bxc4



21.Xxh7! @xh7

21... #b8+ is simply met by 22.6/b3.

22. Wh6 e6

22...e5 23.g5 or 22... we5 23. wxh7+ 如f8 24.f4 \mathred{w}g7 25.\mathred{w}h4 is also hopeless.

23.f4! e5

Or 23... 草b8+ 24. ac1 響xc3 25. 響xh7+ af8 26. Wh8+ 由e7 27. 公f5+, winning the queen! 24.a5! @e8

Or 24...exd4 25. wxh7+ xxf8 26. wh8+ xxe7 27. Wf6+, and mate.

25 @e61 A nice move to wrap it up. Black resigned in

view of 25...fxe6 26.響xh7+ af8 27.響h8+ 中e7 28 耳h7+ ☆f7 29 響f6+

SI 18.6

☐ Hracek ■ Glienke

Pardubice 1999

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 @f6 5.@c3 g6 6.êe3 êg7 7.f3 0-0 8.₩d2 @c6 9.@c4 @d7 10.0-0-0 Ec8 11. 2b3 @e5 12 @b1!?

A useful waiting move, the main point of which is revealed on move 16.

12...@c4

A possible black waiting move is 12... Ze8. when White still goes 13.h4, and White's king move seems to have been more useful than Black's rook move

13.@xc4 Exc4 14.q4 b5?!

With 14... #c7 can avoid the white trick, but then White plays 15.g5 @h5 16.@d5 @d8 17.@c2. and he is better

15.b3! Ac5

Also unpleasant for Black is 15... Ec8 16.@dxb5. An example is Bologan-A.Fedorov. Calcutta 1999: 16... wa5 17.a4 a6 18. 2d5! 響xd2 19. 2xe7+ \$h8 20. 其xd2 Ice8 21.@xg6+ fxg6 22.@xd6 Ie6 23.@c5 @c6 24.@c4 Eb8 25.Ed6 Exd6 26.@xd6. with advantage for White.



16. e6!

Oons! Black loses the exchange. The databaare shows quite a few games in which Black falls for this trick.

16...fxe6 17. 9 xc5 dxc5

After 17 @c7 18 @d4 Ec8 19.95 @h5 20. 0xg7 \$xg7 21. De2 Black had no comnensation for the exchange either, Lobron-Zhu Chen. Bad Homburg 1998.

18.e5

The point of the combination. White wins back a piece, after which he remains an exchange up. 18 Wh8

Or 18 @d5 19 @xd5 exd5 20 @xd5+ 19 ovf6 @ vf6 20 @ vd7 @ vc3

Does Black still have compensation? 21. wxe6+ wq7 22. wxe7+ If7 23. wxc5 Ec7 24. We3 b4 25. Ed3

No not a bit! 25 Wh5 26 Ehd1 @f6 27 We6 Black resigned.

SI 18 7

Istratescu ■ Milu

Bucharest 1994

1 e4 c5 2.9f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 6 f6 5.4c3 q6 6.âe3 âg7 7.f3 0-0 8. Wd2 Oc6 9. Qc4 Qd7 10.0-0-0 Oe5 11. 9 h3 Ic8 12.h4 @c4 13.8xc4 Ixc4 14.h5 @xh5 15.q4 @f6 16.@h6

One of the many possibilities White has here. For some other moves, see the next two games. 16...@xe4!

The correct reply. In contrast to, for example, the game Tal-Wade (SI 18.5) 16... 2xh6? 17. wxh6 axc3 is not good in this position in view of 18.g5! @h5 19.\(\bar{a}\)xh5 gxh5 20.\(\bar{a}\)h1 #68 21 ffvh5 &f5 22 exf5 ffvc2+ 23 @xc2 wxf5 24.g6. We'll see this same theme cropning up again in this game.

17.We3!?

Other moves are less good: 17.fxe4?! #xd4 18 Wh2 Tvd1+ 19 € vd1 @e5 or 17 € xe4?! 置vd4 18 wh2 @e5 19 wh4 置xd1+ 20 少xd1 f5!. or 17. Wh2?! @e5!? 18.f4 @xd4 19. \$\bar{a}xd4 #xd4 20.8g7 #d1+! 21.9xd1 \$xg7 22 響xh7+ 常f6 23.g5+ 常e6 24.響h3+ 常d5 25 \displace displace displace displaced and displaced d with the better prospects for Black.

17... Exc3!

Now this exchange sacrifice is suddenly possible again! Except now it is forced, as 17... 2 f6? is bad in view of 18.2xg7 4xg7 19.營h6+ 4g8 20. 2d5, with a winning attack.

18.bxc3 @f6 19.@xq7 @xq7 20.@h6+ Other possibilities here are 20.2h2 and

20. \$\bar{\text{L}}\text{h4}\$, and the outcome of the complications is unclear.



20...\\approx \approx \approx 8?

This is the wrong place for the king. Correct is 20... \$\dot\notan\text{h8}; after 21. \overline{0}e2 \overline{1}g8 the chances in this position are probably equal.

The way Black is executed in the game speaks for itself.

24. Exh5 @f5 25. @xf5 @xf5 26.g6! ₩xg6 27. \alpha g5 Black resigned.

SI 18.7

☐ Karpov ■ Kortchnoi

Second match game, Moscow 1974

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 q6 6.≗e3 ≗g7 7.f3 @c6 8.₩d2 0-0 9.ûc4 ûd7 10.h4 Ec8 11. 2b3 @e5 12.0-0-0 @c4 13. 2xc4 Exc4 14.h5 @xh5 15.a4 @f6 16.@de2 ₩a5

Tarian's 16... Ee8!? is sometimes indicated as stronger. After 17. h6 Black can play 17... h8, while 17.c5 is met by 17... 2xg4! 18.fxg4 @xg4. But there is probably nothing badly wrong with the text.

17. 8 h6 8 x h6

After 17... e6 White could play 18. exg7 \$\psixg7 19.\psih6+ \$\psig8 20.\pid5! &xd5 21. axd5 ≣e8 22. aef4!, which looks strong, but the exchange sacrifice 17 @h819 18. axf8 axf8 may be another idea. In very sharp variations like these material is often not the most important consideration.

18. wxh6 Ifc8 19. Id3

White still has to be careful! After 19.95?! @h5 20.@g3 Black has the possibility of 20... Exc31

This is refuted with exceptional beauty and elegance. The correct move is 19... 2e6!, with as a possible continuation: 20.g5 @h5 21.@g3

₩e5 22. axh5 (after 22. axh5 gxh5 23. wxh5 \$\forall f8 White doesn't get any further) 22...gxh5 23. @xh5 Exc3! 24.bxc3 Exc3 25.f4 (25.@)f6+ is interesting but not winning: 25...exf6 26.gxf6 響g3 27.基xc3 響g1+ 28.容b2 響b6+ 29. 163 (otherwise it's perpetual check) 29... Wd4+ 30. cl Wgl+ 31. cd2 axb3 32.axb3 \(\sugma g6\), and the endgame will be drawn) 25... Exc2+ 26. \$\psixc2 \$\psic5+\$, and a draw was agreed, since Black will have perpetual check, Bangiev-Nesis, correspondence game 1974/76

20.q5! Exq5

20...@h5 is met by 21.@f4! Exg5 22.@cd5!, and the king's rook is eliminated.



21. Id5! Ixd5 22. 0xd5 Ie8

Not, of course, 22...@xd5 in view of 23. wxh7+, and mate on the next move. 23.9 ef4!

This is far stronger than 23.@xf6+?! exf6 24. wxh7+ wf8, and it is not clear how White's attack should proceed 23. @c6

23... û.e6 is met by 24. @xe6 fxe6 25. @xf6+ exf6 26. wxh7+ &f8 27. wd7, and wins. 24.e5!

A real beauty! 24.0xf6+?! exf6 25.0h5 at once is not clear after 25... #g5+ 26. #xg5

fxg5 27.⊈f6+ dg7.

24...@xd5

Now after 24...dxe5, the idea of 25.6 xf6+ ex16 26 50h5 does: 26...gxh5 27. Igl+, and mate. The text can no longer save Black either. 25 exf6 exf6 26. #xh7+ &f8 27. #h8+

Black resigned After 27 \$27.28 @xd5+it's all over.

SI 18 7

☐ Ristic

■ Marasescu Istanbul 1975

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 6 f6 5.0c3 q6 6.âe3 âg7 7.f3 0c6 8 Wd2 0-0 9.0c4 0d7 10.0-0-0 IIc8 11 @h3 @e5 12 h4 @c4 13 @xc4 Exc4 14.h5 @xh5 15.q4 @f6 16.@d5

A logical move in itself: White wants to swap the (6 knight, an important link in Black's defence. But this idea fails to yield the desired result.

16 @xd5

16...e6 has also been played in several games. Alter 17.0xf6+ 響xf6 18.響h2 罩fc8 19.響xh7+ 容f8 Black holds, e.g. 20.含b1 e5 21.@f5 gxf5 22.gxf5 Exc2 23.Ehg1 (but not 23. Adg1? in view of 23... xf5! 24.exf5 Exb2+) 23... Ee2 (now 23... £xf5? won't work: 24.exf5 基xb2+ 25.\$xb2 e4+ 26.\$d4) 24. 2 o 5 Ecc2, and a draw, Liubinin-Golubev, correspondence game 1987 - Black has pernetnal check

17 exd5 @c7

17... 實b6?! has also been played here, but this is less good: 18.b3 Ec5 19. Wh2 (19. Exh7!? is also strong: 19... 資xh7 20. 實h2+ 賣g8 21 耳h1 e.g. 21...耳fc8 22.實h7+ 索f8 23.皇h6 26 cbc1 響b2+ 27 cbd1 響a1+ 28 cbe2 響b2+ 29.\$\pmu_f1, with advantage) 19...h5 20.gxh5 Afc8 21. \$\pi\b1!, with winning threats.

18. Wh2 h5

This is forced as 18... \$\mathbb{Z}\$c8? is met by 19.\mathbb{\mathbb{E}}\mathbb{x}h7+

少f8 20 息h6 草xc2+ 21 むb1 草xb2+ 22.今xb2 ₩c2+ (or 22...響b6+ 23.\$\psi_a1) 23.\$\psi_a1 \quad \psi_c3+ 24.公b1 Wb4+ 25.公b3, and wins. Thus an analysis by Sapi and A.Schneider.

19.axh5 #c8 20.hxa6

After 20. \$\phi \(\text{\text{\form}} \) 1. \(\text{\text{\sigma}} \) xf5 \(\text{\text{\text{\text{\sigma}}}} \) 21. \(\text{\t ₩xe7 23 貫d2 貫xd2 24 ₩xd2 ₩e5 Black is excellent, but 20.\maddleddd may be a possibility, although after 20...\#a5 things are anything but clear.



20...fxq6?!

Here Black should have played the magic move 20... £f5!: 21.gxf7+ (21. £xf5? is met 22. Idel Ixc2+ 23.0xc2 @xb2+! 24.@dl axc2+ 25.del 響a5+ 26.def2 響xd5 27. 常h5+ 常xh5 28. 基xh5 a6, with a good endgame for Black, Morgado-Valvo, correspondence game 1979.

21. gh7+?

White misses his last chance to usher his king to safety: 21 th!! After the text White is lost

21...\$f7 22.2h6

Now 22. \$\psi\$b1 is no longer possible because of 22... Th8.

22... Xxc2+ 23. b1 Xxb2+!

The Dragon is awash with this type of combination. The king position is dismantled. 24 +xh2 Wc3+ 25 +h1 +f5+

White resigned, as 26.0xf5 \bigwide b2 is mate.

SI 18.8

☐ Piket ■ Sosonko

Findhoven 1993

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 g6 6.@e3 @g7 7.f3 @c6 8.₩d2 0-0 9.âc4 âd7 10.h4 Ec8 11. 2b3 @e5 12.0-0-0 @c4 13 8xc4 Exc4 14.q4 ₩c7

Logical enough; Black puts all his major pieces on the c-file

15.h5 Ec8 16.hxq6 fxq6

16...hxg6? is bad, as 17.2h6 2h8 is met by the thematic 18. 2f8! Txf8 19 Txh8+! doxh8 20. 對h6+ 含g8 21. 公d5! 公xd5 22. 其h1. Black will be mated. Something to remember!

17. ab1!?

This robs the attack on the kingside of a tempo, but the king is safer on b1 than on c1. Just a sample line: 17.響h2?! 耳xc3! 18 bxc3 響xc3 19.響e2 @a4! 20 響d3 (20 dbb12 is very bad: 20...@xe4! 21 fxe4 @xd4 22 @xd4 ②xc2+ 23.⑤c1 ②xd1+) 20...竇a1+ 21.⑥d2 wxa2 22. a1 wc4, with a pleasant endgame for Black

17...b5 18.40d5

Also a logical move; the black of 6 is important for the defence and so has to be exchanged. 18...@xd5 19.exd5 @e5!



To prevent 20, Wh2. This is how Black went under quickly in Beliavsky-Gufeld Novosibirsk 1976: 19... 費h7? 20 費h2 ゆf7 21 費f4よ 李g8 22.基xh7! 黉xd5 (22... 安xh7 23. 黉f7 and 型h1. mate) 23.星xg7+! \$\prime xg7 24.@f5+ \$\prime xf5\$ 25.\\hat{\psi}\h6+ \psi\frac{1}{26}\,\bar{a}\xd5 \hat{\alpha}\xc2+ 27.\\hat{\psi}\alpha\left\ \h4 28.b3 基c3 29.基d2 a5 30.息g5 \$p8 31 其xc2! 基xc2 32.對xg6+ 由f8 33. ah6 mate

20 W43

Black meets 20 f4? with 20 @xd4 21 @xd4 基xc2 22.黉e3 axg4, and after 20.黉f2?! 基f8 21. Wh4 Black can strengthen his position with 21 #f7

20. Wh7

After 20... \$\bar{L}\$f8?! 21.\$\bar{L}\$h6?! \$\bar{L}\$f7 22.\$\Oe6 &xe6\$ 23.dxe6 罩f6 24.罩dh1 罩b4 25.总c1 豐c4 26. Exh7 Exe6 27.f4 &g7 28.b3 a draw was agreed in an earlier game Piket-Sosonko Dutch championship 1992. According to the Hungarian brothers I. and Z.Almasi, however, 21. Exh7! &xh7 22. Eh1+ is stronger: 22...\$27 23.\$h6+ \$f7 24.0e6 \$xe6 25.dxe6+ &xe6 26.2xf8 &f7 27.2h6, with the better prospects for White. The plan is ©c1 and ≣h7



21. Exh7! *xh7 22. Eh1+ *g7 23. Eh6

This loses! 24...\$f7?! 25.@e6! Exg6 26.@d8+ drg7 27.@xb7, with two extra pawns, is also good for White, but after 24...\$f8! Black holds. White has to go for

pernetual check with 25. Exg8+ (25. @h6+? \$17 26.0e6 won't work now: 26... Exg6 27 4)d8+ \$\psi_e8 28 \Phi(xb7 \mathbb{\mathbb{R}}xb6) 25...\phixg8 26. 實 6+ 含h8 27. 實 h6+ 查 g8 28. 實 g6+.

25. Ih6+! \$q7 26. @e6+! &xe6 27.dxe6 ±18 28 ₩15+ 016 29 ₩h5

And Black resigned, as mate cannot be prevented.

SI 18.9

☐ Gobet ■ Kudrin

Bern 1988

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 66 5.@c3 q6 6.êe3 êg7 7.f3 @c6 8. #d2 0-0 9. 2c4 2d7 10.0-0-0 Ec8 11 9 h3 @e5 12 h4 h5

Kudrin's own move. Black stops the white advance h4-h5.

13. 9 h6 9 xh6

A well-known theme. Black allows the white queen 'free' access to h6, but this takes it pretty far away from the events on the other side of the board. Other moves here are 13...@c4 and 13...a5.

14. Wxh6 Exc3!

This exchange sacrifice should look pretty familiar by now

15 hxc3 @c7

Also possible is 15... #a5, e.g. 16. ab1 ac8 17.04 Oc4 18.0xc4 Exc4 19.0e2 0e6 20 gxh52 (20 耳d5!?) 20... [xe4! 21.@c1 (or 22.hxg6 @xa2+ 23.\$b2 \$\alpha\$ 24.4e2 @b3!, and White resigned, Topuria-Dushkin, correspondence game 1987/88.

16. \$b1!?

After 16 @e2 Black can continue 16... @b5 or 16 a5

16. Ec8!

After 16... 實xc3?! 17. @e2 實c5 18.g4! White has a strong attack, while 16,...a5?! 17.f4 fig4 18.響g5 a4 19.fxe5 axb3 20.cxb3 公f2 21 e61 as in Short-Olafsson, Wiik aan Zee 1987 and other games, favours White,

17.q4!

After 17.\d2?! Black has the strong 17...a5, while 17.f4 @c4 18.\dag{18}d3 is also unclear. 17...a5



18.axh5

White has two alternatives here: 18.0f5!? @xf5 19. exf5 @xc3 20.fxg6 @c4, with an unclear position, and 18.g5!? @e8 19.f4 a4 20. 2d5, which could be awkward for Black. 18 a4 19 @d5

19.hxg6 axb3 20.gxf7+ 含xf7 21.cxb3 實xc3

is unclear. 19...@xd5

Less good is 19...@xh5?! 20.f4!. 20.exd5 \wxc3 21.hxg6 \wb4+

The most accurate move. The game Khalifman-Saychenko, Simferopol 1988, also ended in a draw after 21...fxg6?! 22.\pm\f \mathbb{g} f5 23.0xf5?! 響xc2+, but with 23.響d2! White could have thrown a spanner in the works.

22. c1 fxq6 23. Ehq1 &f5! 24. 6xf5 Now 24 #d2? was impossible of course: 24 Wa3+25 cbhl @c4

24... wa3+ 25. b1

White has to settle for a draw, as 25. \$\d2? won't work: 25... €xf3+ 26. \$e2 €xg1+ 27. #xg1 #xc2+.

25 Wh4+ 26 Oc1 Wa3+ 27 Ob1 Draw

SI 18 12

☐ Anderson ■ Taylor

Correspondence game 1994

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 g6 6.@e3 @g7 7.f3 @c6 8.\d2 0-0 9.\dc4 \dd7 10.0-0-0 \pic8 11. £b3 @e5 12.h4 h5 13. £a5 Ic5 14. \$b1 b5 15.q4 a5

For 15...hxg4, see the game Lanka-Smirin 16.axh5

16. £xf6 £xf6 17.gxh5 has also been tried here. You'll have to look it up in the theory books, because we won't go into it here. 16...a4

16...@xh5 could be met by 17.@d5 ≣e8 18. 2f4!?, with obscure complications in which White has good prospects.



17.h6

17.hxg6, 17.ûd5 and 17.ûxf7+ have also been played here; in all cases it is unclear what the complications will lead to 17...@h8 18.h7+ @xh7

Bad is 18... \$\psi xh7?; after 19.h5 \$\infty xh5\$ 20. 基xh5+ gxh5 21. 管h2 含g6 22. 基h1 ii is

19.2d5 b4 20.0ce2 0xq5 21.hxq5 e6 22.\#f4

The game G.Garcia-Kudrin, Salamanca 1989, saw 22. 2f4 2g7 23. 2dxe6 fxe6 24. 2xe6 2xe6 25. 2xe6+ 2f7 26.f4 Ie8 27. wxd6 wxd6 28. 基xd6 如f8 29. 基a6. with an unclear endgame

22... aq7 23. h4 Ie8 24.f4 exd5 25.f5! 25.fxe5?! dxe5 is good for Black

25...f6

Forced; White was threatening 26.f6. 26.9 f4 fxa5

26...dxe4? is met by 27.響h7+ 会f8 28.罩h6! and wins: 28... \$xf5 29. 0xf5 9xf5 30 9xf6 or 28...fxg5 29.@xg6+.

27. #h7+ #18 27... \$17? runs into 28.fxg6+, of course, and White wins

28.4 fe6+ The following sequence is forced. 28...@xe6 29.fxe6 dxe4 30.\df1+ @f3

31. 0xf3 exf3 32. 2xf3+ 2f5 33 2xf5+ axf5 34.2h6!

Here a draw was agreed. After 35. Wxf5+ \$\psig8 36.\pih7+ it's perpetual check.

SI 18.12

☐ Lanka

■ Smirin

Moscow 1989

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 q6 6.@e3 @q7 7.f3 0-0 8. ₩d2 @c6 9. ac4 ad7 10.h4 h5 11.0-0-0 @e5 12.@b3 Ec8 13.@g5 Ec5 14. b1 b5 15.g4 hxg4

For the other move, 15...a5, see the game Anderson-Taylor.

16.h5 Exc3!?

Material is unimportant! After 16...@xh5 17. ad5 星e8 18. 基xh5 gxh5 19. 對h2! White has excellent attacking chances, as was borne out in, for example, Karpov-Sznapik, Dubai Olympiad 1986.

17.bxc3

After 17. #xc3 @xh5 18.fxg4 @xg4 19. Edg1 ₩d7 the position isn't clear either. There is also 17.h6!?, which leads to obscure complications after 17...@xf3 18.@xf3 @xe4



17...@xf3!

Less good is 17...@xh5?!, as 18.\ xh5! gxh5 19 Wh2 gives White good attacking chances. 18.6 xf3

With 18 We31? White can avoid the looming complications, but even then the position remains complicated.

18 @ye4! 19 Wh2 @yc3+ 20 cc1 Wa5 Bud is 20...gxf3? 21.hxg6 @e2+ 22.\$d2 wins

21 hya6

The position is chaotic. The text urges Black to hurry, as White is now threatening mate, Maybe 21. ad4!? £f5 22.h6 was an option, or 21 #d3 @f5 22.h6 @a3+ 23.dd2 @e4+ 24 dol1 @c3 25 @d4!2. Both continuations were suggested by Golubey, a great Dragon expert, in his monograph Easy Guide to the Dragon from 1999.

#c3+ 24. dc1

White settles for the draw, probably wisely. The position after 24. \$\preceq\$e2 \$\preceq\$xf3+ 25.\$\preceq\$e1 青年4+26. 電d2 響d4+(even 26... 響xg6!? is an

option: Black has no fewer than five pawns for the rook, and the white king remains exposed) 27. 如e2 響e4+ 28. ae3 is very unclear. 24... wa3+ 25. d2 wc3+ 26. c1 wa3+ Draw

SI 18.15

□ Topalov

■ Romero Holmes

Leon 1993

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0 xd4 @f6 5.@c3 g6 6.@e3 @g7 7.f3 0-0 8. Wd2 0c6 9. 2c4 2d7 10.h4 0e5 11.2b3 h5 12.0-0-0 Ic8 13.2a5 Ic5 14.q4!? hxq4 15.f4

Many games, especially correspondence games, have been played with 15,2xf6 and 15.h5. Correspondence players like these sharp lines, but even in the calm of one's study - and with the aid of computers these days! - it is utterly impossible to calculate everything. 15.... €c4 16. #e2

The much-played alternative is 16. #d3, while 16. 2xc4 2xc4 17.e5 is another possibility. 16...b5 17.f5



17.@cxb5 is met by 17...@xb2! 18.@xb2 @xb5 19.@xb5 @xe4+, with unclear play. 17.h5 @xh5 18.f5 \#a5 also leads to positions that are hard to assess

17 Wh6?

This move was recommended in 1989 by the great Dragon experts Sapi and Schneider in their book about the Dragon with 9. 2c4, but their variation turns out to be wrong! 17...\#a5!?. 17... Wc8!? and 17...gxf5!? is where hener possibilities will have to be found.

18.h5!

Less good is 18. 2xf6?! 2xf6 19. 2xg4 a5. and Black has counterplay.

18...@xh5

game is lost.

18...gxh5 is met by 19.@xf6 @xf6 20.\\xi\$xh5 2e5 21. ₩h2, and White has a very dangerous attack that may already be unstoppable. 19. ₩xg4 @xb2 20. \$xb2 Exc3 21. \$xc3 ₩c5+ 22.\$b2 &xd4+ 23.\$b1 &q7

All this can be found in Sapi and Schneider's book. They conclude that "Black has an attack", but this turns out to be untrue: White wins by force! 23... 當c3 24. 基xd4 當xd4 25.Qe3 響g7 26.響xg6 響xg6 27.fxg6 公f6 28. h6 e6 29. xf8 \$xf8 30. 其h8+ \$g7 31.gxf7, by the way, also loses for Black: after 31... \$\prix\$t7 32.e5! dxe5 33.\$\bar{\pi}\$a8 the end-



24. @h6! Ouite simple, really! 24...₩c3

The point is that after 24. @xh6 White wins with 25 @xe6+

25.≗xq7 ₩xq7 26.2dq1

Black resigned.

SI 18.16

☐ Hodgson ■ Paunovic

Telex London-Relorade 1976

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4

@f6 5.@c3 q6 6.@e3 @q7 7.f3 0-0 8. ₩d2 2c6 9.2c4 2d7 10.0-0-0 ₩b8

This is a rather bizarre move, but it may be playable. Black puts all his money on the counterattack.

11.h4 Ac8

Black could also have tried 11 b512 and after 12.@dxb5 \(\frac{1}{2} \)c8 he will have compensation for the pawn. According to an analysis by the Russian analyst Vulfson, however, 12. &b3!? a5 13.@d5 @xd5 14.@xd5 #c8 15.h5 is good for White.

12. 2 b3 a5

After 12 b5 White would have attacked at once with 13 h5!

13 h5!?



Another option was 13.a4!? which is Golubey's suggestion.

13 ..@xd421

This turns out to be a bad idea. Better is 13...a4 14. 2d5 @xh5 (14...e6 is met strongly by 15.hxg6!, e.g. 15...exd5 16.@h6! fxg6 17. axg7 axg7 18. wh6+ af7 19. axd5, with an attack) 15.g4 @f6 16.@f5!? gxf5 17.gxf5 4.c5 18. 實g2 gh8 19. 其dg1 其g8 20. gg5 實f8 21. #h3 h6 22. axf6 exf6, with an unclear position. Thus an analysis by Tisdall.

14.9xd4 a4 15.9d5 e6

Winning a piece.... But it doesn't give Black much joy

16.hxq6 hxq6

After 16...exd5 White plays 17.@xd5, and wins, while 16...fxg6 is met by 17. 2xf6 2xf6 18. Wh6.

17.₩a5! e5

After 17 ... exd5 White had planned 18. \ xf6!.



Or 18... @xh8 19. @xg6+ @g7 20. @xf7+, and Black is mated. 19. 2 xf7

Black resigned. There is no remedy against 20 Th1+

Scheveningen Variation

Black plays 2...d6 and 5...e6

SI 19.13

☐ Nisipeanu ■ Dumitrescu

Baile Herculane 1994

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 @f6 5.@c3 e6 6.@e3 a6 7.f3 @bd7 8.g4 h6 9.h4 b5 10.\(\bar{a}\)a1 a6

10... ab6 is also worth looking at, e.g. 11.g5 @fd7 12.₩e2 hxg5 13.hxg5 g6 14.0-0-0 @c4 15.2f2 2b7, with an unclear position. Anand-Judit Polear Linares 1994

11.q5 hxq5 12.hxq5 @h5 13.\d2 After 13.a4 b4!? 14.公c6 響c7 15.公xb4 ao7 16. 2d3 2b8 17. 2e2 2c5 Black had counter-

play for the pawn, Short-Kasparov, rapid game London 1987. 13... 9b7 14.0-0-0 b4 15.0 ce2 d5

16. Ih1 Ig8

16...dxe4?! is met strongly by 17.6\f4.



17.\\\xh5!?

An earlier game Nisipeanu-Dumitrescu. Rumania 1994, saw 17. h3 Oc5 18. Of4 Oxf4 19. axf4 ad6 20. axd6 響xd6 21. ab1 響b6 22.實f4 dxe4 23.fxe4 算d8, with unclear play White had probably prepared the text at home, 17...gxh5 18.g6! Exg6

18...fxg6? is inferior, of course, in view of 19 @xe6

19.0\f4.0\e5!?

Less good is 19... \$\mugges g8?! 20.exd5 e5 21. \$\omega c6\$ #c7 22.@xh5, with the point of 22...@xc6 23.dxc6 wxc6 24 wxd7+1 19 mb621 20.exd5 e5 21.@fe6! also yields White good prospects, 19...e5?! 20.@xg6 exd4 21.@o5. finally, also favours White. Thus an analysis by Nisipeanu.

20.exd5 @xd5 21.@e1! @e7?!

Now Black slips up. Better is 21... \#a5!. After 22, 9f2, 6/xf3, 23, 6/xf3, 9/xf3, 24 E/d3 <u>Qg4 25.</u> ②xg6 響g5+ 26. 當b1 響xg6 27. Qo2 the position is unclear, according to Nisipea-

22.公f5! 賞d7

After 22...exf5? 23.@xd5 @b7 24.@g5 it's over. The other queen move, 22... \$\display b7, is met by 23.@xd5 exd5 24.@h3! (after 24.@f4?! Black has the rejoinder 24... Ee6 25. 2xe5 f6) 24... 其e6 25. 公d4 其e7 26. 微g3. with excellent attacking play for White.

23. @h3! f6?

This more or less clinches it Relatively better was 23 0-0-0 although 24 @xd5 exd5 25.4)e7+ @xe7 26.@xd7+ #xd7 27.@f4 is still better for White

24. #xd5! exd5 25. @xq6 @xq6 26. @c5+ .4d8 27. 2b6+

Black resigned in view of 27... \$\precederal c 8 28. \$\overline{0} d6+.

SI 19 14

☐ Perenvi Barczav

Hungary 1979

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 @f6 4.@c3 cxd4 5. xd4 a6 6. e3 e6 7.q4!?

This move has been played a lot over the last few decades. The present white player has popularised it, and the variation bears his

7..h6

An important alternative is 7...e5.

R Wf3

For 8.f4, see the game Shirov-Kasparov. 8...@bd7 9.\mathbb{\max}\mod}\mathbb{\

9 e5 10.5/f5 g6 is met by 11.g5! gxf5 12 exf5 with good prospects for White. 10 f3 e5

10...b5? is very risky, probably even losing: 11.g5 @g8 12.g6 fxg6 13.0-0-0 e5 14.@f5 exf5 15.費h5+ 会d7 16.費f7+, with a fierce attack e.g. 16... #e7 17. 2xb5+! axb5 18 算xd6+! \$\psixd6 19.算d1+ \$\psic6 20.費d5+ ◆b6.21 響xa8 @b7.22 公d5+ @xd5.23.罩xd5. 11 @h3 @e6 12.0-0-0! @xb3+ 13.axb3

耳c8 14.公d5! &xd5 15.exd5 賞c7 After 15... #a5 16.25 @d7 17. ab1 White is also better.

16.c3 ₩a5

Threatening 17... Exc3+, followed by perpetual check; but White has a simple refutation. 17. ac4! b5 18.q5 ad7 19.b4 wa4

No better is 19... 響a1+20. 雪c2 響a4+21. 息b3 微xb4 22.其bg1, with threats like 23.其a1, followed by 24 \$94, winning the queen, and 23 σ6 After 19 . \@c7 20.\@d3. too. things are looking grim for Black.

20 0d3 ₩a1+

Or 20... 響xb4 21. 雲b1 響a5 (21... 基xc3 won't work in view of 22. 2d2) 22.g6, and the white attack should strike home.

21. c2



21...\mathbb{# a2?

This loses by force, but after 21... #a4+ 22. \$\psi b1 \Bxc3! 23.g6! \Ba3! 24.gxf7+ \$\psi d8 25 bxa3 Wb3+ 26.dxc1 Wc3+ 27.ac2 wye3+ 28 \$b2 \$b6 29 \$d3 White remains

better Thus Perenvi 22.g6! 響a4+ 23.eb1 Exc3 24.Ec1!

Well spotted, although just 24.gxf7+ would win as well.

24... II a 3

25 @xd7+!

Black resigned. He will be mated: 25... \$\psi xd7\$ 26.9f5+ \$\preceq\$e8 27.\$\bar{\pi}c8+ \$\preceq\$e7 28.\$\bar{\pi}c7+ \$\preceq\$e8 29.exf7+ 如d8 30.單d7+ 如c8 31.單c1+ 如b8 32.@a7+ \$a8 33.Ec8!

SI 19 14

☐ Shirov

■ Kasparov Linares 1998

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 € 16 5.€ c3 a6 6. e3 e6 7.q4 h6 8.f4 e5 Another option is 8... 2c6, when White can

reply 9.h3, 9. #f3 or 9.g5. 9.0 f5 h512

This is probably stronger than 9... 2c6, when White can go 10.\documents f3 g6 11.0-0-0!: 11...gxf5 12.exf5 e4 13.0xe4 0xe4 14.\\xxxxxxxxxxxxxx 15. 實d3 息g7 16. âd2?! (here White could have played 16.2b6! 0-0 17. wxd6, and despite his extra piece, Black's position is a shambles) 16...0-0 17.g5 hxg5 18.fxg5 We5 19.f6 £f5 (Black frees himself - perpetual check was looming) 20.響g3 置fc8 21.总c3 @b4! 22.@xe5 Exc2+ 23.@b1 Ee2+ 24 @a1 @c2+ 25.\$b1 @a3++, and a draw, Anand-Kasparov, Dos Hermanas 1996

10.axh5

White has other possibilities here, e.g. 10. 2d5 and 10.g5. An example with the latter move is 10...@xe4 11.@xe4 @xf5 12.@g2 2c6 13.0-0 @d7 14.fxe5 2xe5 15.2f4 2e7 16.6 xd6+! @xd6 17.@xe5 @xe5 18.@xd7+ dxd7 (18... axd7 19. ae1) 19. axf5, with an equal endgame, Leko-Shirov, Polanica Zdroi

10...exf4 11. 2xf4 @xh5



12.9 xd6+

12. 2e3 could be met by 12...g6 13. 2d4 2g3 14.hxg3 基xh1 15.瞥f3 基h5 16.公d5 皇g7 17.0-0-0 公c6 18.公xc6 bxc6 19. ab6 實g5+ 20. 全e3 響d8, and move repetition, according to Kasparov.

12....@xd6 13. @xd6

13. ₩xd6? is bad; 13... ₩h4+ 14. 2g3 Øxg3 15.hxg3 響xh1 16.公d5 (16.0-0-0 響h6+) 16... 響xe4+ 17. e2 国h1+ 18. ed2 響d4+ again according to Kasparov.

13...響h4+ 14.金d2 響g5+

Black can still try 14... Th6, but after 15.2xb8 響g5+ (15...基xb8?! 16.響el) 16.雲el 響h4+ it will just be perpetual check again.

15. be1 wh4+ 16. cd2 wg5+ 17. ce1 And a draw was agreed. This perpetual also occurred in a number of other games, such as Timman-Kasparov, Wijk aan Zee 1999.

SI 19 14

☐ Gorelikov

Wohl

Correspondence game 1992

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 a6 6.@e3 e6 7.g4 e5!? The sharpest reply, 7...h6 was played in Perenyi-Barczay and Shirov-Kasparov. 8.415 g6 9.4g2

A positional and less tactical piece sacrifice than the other possibility, 9.g5. 9...qxf5 10.exf5 Iq8 11.h3 @c6 12.We2 Øe7 13 f4 ₩c7



14.0-0-0

LL five5_dxe5_15.0=0=0_@d7_16.@f2_@c6 17. 0 h6 營h8 18. Thel has also been played here In Landenbergue-Chachere, Switzerland 1993 there followed 18...h5 19.2c5! hxg4 20.2d6 Wc8 21.2xe5 gxh3 22.2xh3 ±e7 23, 2d6 2f8 24.2xe7 2xe7 25. Exe7+! tyu7 26 響c5+ \$e8 27 耳e1+ êe4 28 響e5+ ±18 29.響xf6 響c6 30.響h4 ad5 31.f6. and Black resigned. Stronger, however, is 18... @xg2! 19. 對xg2 (19. 單d8+ 對xd8 job either) 19...@c6, when it's an open question whether White has enough compensation for the piece.

14... 2d7

14 @xf51? is also worth looking at, Black is a piece up, so he is in a position to give one back. 15 Wf2

And here 15. ad2!? has been suggested. 15....@c6 16.@b6 @b8 17.q5

As usual, winning back the material in these lines does not have the desired effect. After 17 fxe5 dxe5 18 算d8+ 實xd8 19.章xd8 算xd8 Black has more than enough material for the aueen. In Nikolenko-Lepeshkin, Moscow 1989, he maintained the pressure with 18. The 1, when 18...h5 is satisfactory. 17... @ xa2

17 @d7 18 @e4 @xb6 19.@f6+ is good for White



18.axf6!?

After 18. wxg2 Black plays 18... d7 after all. 18...@c8!

The correct reply! Less good is 18... ah6? 19 Tho 1 @xf4+ 20 @b1 @c8 21 Exg2 Exg2 22.曹xg2 公xb6 23.曹g8+ 由d7 24.曹xf7+ \$c6 25.0e4 d5 26.響e6+ \$b5 27.算xd5+. winning, or 18...@xh1? 19.fxe7 @h6 20 互xh1 axf4+ 21.abl 響c8 22.基d1 響xf5 23. #xd6 @xe7 24. #c5 @e8 25. @d5, also winning These variations are from Wohl.

19. Ehg1 @xb6 20. wxb6 wc8!

Again the strongest reply. After 20... #d8? Exe2 24. Exe2 @xf4+ 25. ddl White is better

21. Txd6!

White's best chance as 21.242 wxf5 @h6 wins for Black.

21... wxf5!

But not 21. @xd6? 22.豐xd6 豐d7 23.豐xe5+ ☆f8 24 ¥c5+ ☆e8 25 其e1+, and Black might as well resign.

22 Td2

22. Od5 @xd5 23. Exg8 wxf4+ 24. 空d1 @f3+ 25 de1 We4+ also favours Black, e.g. 26. 中d2 管e2+ 27. 中c3 草c8+ 28. 中b3 管xc2+ 29 tha 3 Wd3+ (and not, of course, 費b5 31.費xb5+ axb5 32.查b2 e4, Wohl.

22... Ag6! 23.4 b5

A last-ditch attempt. 23. \(\bar{\pmage}\) gxg2? loses: 23... 基xg2 24. 基xg2 響xf4+ 25. 基d2 皇h6. 23. 基gd 1 響xf4 24. 中b1 響xf6 25. 響xf6 基xf6 26.其xg2 其f4, in the meantime, gives Black a favourable endgame

23...axb5 24.\(\mathbb{L}\)gxg2 e4!

And not 24... \$\begin{aligned}
&\begin{aligned}
&\begin{a 25. Wxb7 Ic8 26. Ixq6 After 26 #e41? Black also wins with 26...e3!

27 Td3 @d6!

26...hxq6 27. ab1 e3 28. ad3 ad6!

White resigned. After 29. ac3+ \$\psi f8\$ it's all over. Razor-sharp defending by Black!

SI 19 14

☐ Rytshagov Shishkov

Tallinn 1998

1.e4 c5 2.6 f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.6 xd4 @f6 5.@c3 a6 6.@e3 e6 7.g4 e5 8.@f5 g6 9.g5 gxf5 10.exf5

10.gxf6 f4 has to be good for Black.

10...d5 11.axf6

For 11. #f3, see the game Shirov-Van Wely. 11...d4 12. ac4 wxf6

12...dxe3? clearly loses the queen after 13. xf7+, but 12... c7 is probably playable: 13.\dd dxe3 14.0-0-0 exf2 15.\(\hat{L}\xxxxxxxf7+1?\) (15.黉e2!?, a move from the Dutch correspondence player Piet de Laat, is also possible here) 15... \$xf7 16. \$\ddot d5+ \$\ddot e8\$ (Black may survive 16... \$\pixf6 17.5\cdot e4+ \$\pice e7 18 f6+ as well, but it looks pretty scary) 17.f7+ \$e7 18.豐f3 gh6+ 19.gb1 gf8 20.賣xf2 公c6 21. 對h4 息f4 22. 對f6 對xf7 23. 對xh8+ 對o8 24.\footnote{\pi}f6+ \footnote{\pi}f7 25.\footnote{\pi}h8+, and perpetual check, Movsesian-Ribli, Austria 1999

13. 4 d5 #c6 14. 4 xd4! 4 b4+ After 14... #xc4? 15.0f6+ de7 16.0xe5 or

14...exd4? 15. wxd4 Black loses quickly. 15.c3 @xc4 16. 9e3 9a5

Good for White is 16... 2e7 17.5 h6 Wc6 18. Ig1, but 16... £xf5 may also be worth considering: 17.cxb4 @e4 18.2f6+ de7 19. 2g4 全d3! 20.響g5 \$e6 an idea of Petursson's Does White have anything?

17. 2f6+ \$e7 18.2 a5 \$c6

After 18... ac7 Shirov has recommended 19. md5!, when a nice variation is 19... maxd5 20.@xd5++ &d6 21.0-0-0 &c6 22.@e7+ \$\dip b6 23.\dip e3+ \dip a5 24 \dip d5+ b5 25 a4 \dip c6 26.b4+ 公xb4 27.cxb4+ 全xb4 28.4b2 息b7 29. ad2+ axa4 30. 其al mate! After 18... 其d8 Fracnik has indicated the following variation: 19. 公xh7+ f6 20. &xf6+ 如e8 21. 響h5+ 響行 22. Wh6!, with a strong attack, e.g. 22... Id6 23.耳g1 ②d7 24.耳g6.



19 Wh3! Td8

Black must not accept the double rook sacrifice: 19... 響xh1+ 20 de2 響xal 21 響a3」1 dd8 22.@e8+, and mate, while 19...@xf5 20.0-0-0 also looks lost for Black. But the text won't save him either

20. 0 d5++ we8 21.0-0-0 IId6

Or 21... axd5 22. axd5 axf5 23. ae1! ac7 24. Eexe5+ @e6 (24...@xe5 25. Ed8 mate) 25. #b4, and it's finished, Rytshagov. 22.₩a3 @d8

Or 22...f6 23.@xf6 @d7 24.\hat{\textbf{Z}}hgl!, and the rook intervenes decisively, or 22... b6 23 @e3 Exd1+ 24. Exd1 f6 25. âh6 響c5 26. 響b3. Again according to Rytshagov.

25. #xd1+ \$\psi_e8

And Black resigned without waiting for

SI 19.14

☐ Shirov ■ Van Welv

26 @d5

Istanbul Olympiad 2000

1.e4 c5 2.4\f3 d6 3.d4 cvd4 4.4\vd4 @f6 5.@c3 a6 6.@e3 e6 7.g4 e5 8.@f5 g6 9.q5!? qxf5 10.exf5 d5 11.\#f3 For 11 gxf6, see the previous game.

11 . d4 12.0-0-0 @bd7 13. gd2

Another idea is 13.gxf6 dxc3 14.@c4 \mathbb{\pi}xf6 15. Ihgl, with an unclear position. According to Gallagher, Black can now go 15...h5! in order to meet 16.2g5 with 16...2h6. 13 Wc7 14.gxf6 dxc3 15.0xc3 Wc6

After a queen swap White is left with nothing, of course.



16 Wxh1

The intermediate check 16 @h6+ 17 @h1 19.耳g1+ 空h8 20.全b4 公c5 (20...萬g8? 21 IIx98+ dx98 22 de7, and White was winning Shiroy-Van Wely Polanica Zdroi 2000) 21 Wc3 Wxf6 22 @xc5 @xf5 with an unclear position, Kalka-Van Wely, German Bundesliga 2000, Whether 18... \$\mu g8\$ is an improvement in this line is doubtful: 19, @h3 .bd8?! 20.@b4! 響xf6 21.響c4 草g5? (21...b5 22 @a5+ 中e8 23. We7 草g5 24.草d6 e4 White, although a lot less clear) 22. 基d6 響g7 23.f6 Ag1+ 24.2f1, and Black resigned, Shirov-Topalov, Wijk aan Zee 2001.

17. g2 gh6+

17... Ig8!? is an idea from the Dutch master Karel van der Weide. After 18. wxg8 wxh2 the queen escapes. A possible continuation is 19. dd5 響h6+ 20.f4 響xf6 21.fxe5 響g7 22.萬g1 響xg8 23.萬xg8 a5 24.b4 axb4

25 @xb4 \$a426 @d6 \$a627 @b4 \$a4 and a draw by renetition. But is this sequence for-

18. 2 d2 2 xd2+ 19. 4 xd2 #xq2?

Now Black is doomed 19...\wxdl+! 20. \$\psixd1 \(\frac{1}{2} \)f8 is a better attempt to stay alive. After, for example, 21.2d5 a5 22.2c4 b6 23.曾g2 罩b8 24.曾d5 雪d8 25.皇b5 罩b7 26 單d6 罩e8 27.单c4 b5 28.单xf7 罩b6 he is still very much in the game. Thus an analysis by Raikovic

20. wxq2 a5 21.f4 exf4 22. wq7! If8 23. Ee1+ &d8 24. Ee7 &c7 25. wxf8 Black resigned.

SI 19 16

☐ Gottlieb ■ Psakhis

Winnipeg 1997

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 a6 5.0c3 d6 6.2e3 b5 7.f3 2b7 8.\d2 Ød7 9.0-0-0 Øqf6 10.q4 Øb6 11.h4 Ec8 12.a3

An interesting but dubious sacrifice is 12.6\cxb5?! axb5 13.\(\hat{a}\xb5+\). In the game Short-Hübner Brussels 1986, there followed 13 公fd72! 14 響b4 響c7 15.響b3 索d8? 16.2g5+ 2e7 17.2xd7 4xd7 18.2b5, with advantage for White. But after the better 13...@bd7! the situation is very unclear.

12...@fd7 13.@g5 @e7

After 13 #c7 14 @dxb5! axb5 15.@xb5 the sequence 15 Wb8 16 @xd6+ @xd6 17. 資xd6 資xd6 18. 基xd6 is probably good for White, who has three pawns for the piece. But 15... \$\psic c.g. 16.\text{\text{\text{\text{g}}} e3 \text{\ti}\text{\tex{ ©xd2.18.@xd6@xf3.19.@xf8@xf8.20.\\\\\\ @xe4 21.@d3 @c6 22.\c7 \c7 \c7 23.@xc7 sbe7 is unclear according to Psakhis.

14. @dxb5!?

After 14.2xe7 wxe7 the position is roughly equal.

14...axb5 15.@xb5

Another idea is 15.@xe7!? @xe7 16.@xb5: after 16...d5 17.@xd7+ @xd7! 18.exd5 0-0 19.dxe6 @e5 the position is unclear, Psakhis. 15 4512

Here 15... 9c5 16 0xd6+ \wxd6 17 \wxd6 @xd618. Exd6 was good for White again, but 15...f6!? 16.@f4e5 17.@e3d5 was also worth a try, Psakhis,



16... ∳ xd6

The point of the previous move. Black gets three pieces for the queen and two pawns. The material balance is unclear!

17. @xd8 #xd8 18. @b521

According to Psakhis, 18,f4! 0-0 19,e5 is a better idea 18...0-0 19 f4

Maybe 19. 2xd7!? was stronger, because now the black knight gets to e4.

19...@c5 20.e5 @e4! 21.\hb

An alternative was 21. We1!?, again according to Psakhis.

21... û c5 22 f5 IIa8l

22 6 f2 23 f6 is unclear

23 Wf42

A mistake in time-trouble. Stronger was 23. ade I, although this is met by 23... axa3!. with good prospects for Black after 24.bxa3 £xa3+ 25. \$\d1 \Dc3+ 26.\$\d2 \Defxb5 27.\$\d1 6 c4+

23... Exa3!

A decisive sacrifice. The white king position is overwhelmed by an entire army of black pieces.

24.bxa3 Or 24.始月 萬a5. followed by 25. 耳fa8.

24...@xa3+ 25.@b1 @c3+ 26.@a1 Ta8 27. a4

Desperation 27...@bxa4 28.Eb1 @b2+! 29.Exb2 Øc5±

White resigned.

SI 19 16

☐ Movsesian ■ Kasparov

Saraievo 2000

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3 d4 cvd4 4 0 vd4 @f6 5. Øc3 a6 6. e3 e6 7.f3 b5 8. ₩d2 ②bd7 9.0-0-0 &b7 10.q4 公b6 11.實行2 Alternatives are 11.2d3, 11.h4 and 11.g5, 11 Øfd7 12 db1

Safer is 12.9d3 #c8 13 @ce2

White must have provoked the exchange sacrifice on c3 on purpose, because it had all been played before.



13... Exc3!

This won't have cost Kasnarov much time! He

turns the white castled position into a heap. 14.bxc3 ₩c7

After the game Kasparov indicated 14... 2a4!? as more accurate. The queen can then go to a5 if necessary

15.@e2 @e7 16.g5 0-0 17.h4 @a4 18 0 c1 @e5 19 h5

19.f4 is met by 9...@xd3 20.cxd3 d5!, and

White is in great trouble. 19...d5!

Even now this is still a strong move. 20 @h2 @d6 21 @h3?!

Now it's easy. White's best chance was 21. a f4!?, when Kasparov produced the following analysis: 21...b4! 22.cxb4 #c8 23.#c1 d4! 24 chal (or 24 a3 a5 25 4b5 @c3+1 26. 2xc3 2xf3, with advantage for Black) 24... axb4? is not good in view of 25 c31 Wh6 26 @ve5 @a3 27 @vd41 @b2+ 28. 中b1 皇xc1+ 29. 中xc1 耳xc3+ 30. 皇c2. and Black has nothing) 25.@xd4.@xb4! 26.@b3 (after 26 @xe5 Wa5 it's over at once) 26 響d7.27 草cfl 響a4.28 のcl のxa21.29 のxa2 \$c3+30 dbh @xd3 and Black wins

21... 9xd3 22.cxd3 b4!



23 cxb4

Or 23.c4 dxc4 24.g6 cxd3 25.\(\maxrta{\textbf{Z}}\)xd3 \(\maxrta{\textbf{Z}}\)c8 26. Ad2 &e5 27. Add1 &c6 28.h6 &b5, and the threat of 29... xe2 decides. Kasparov. 23... I c8! 24. ba1 dxe4

With 24 @xb4! Black could win at once:

25. Wh2 Wc2 26.g6 2c3. 25.fxe4 @xe4! 26.q6

Or 26.dxe4 &e5+ 27.@d4 &xd4+ 28.\u00e4xd4 wxc1+ 29 Exc1 Exc1 mate!

\$f8! 29.₩q2

After 29.2b2 Black wins with 29... #c2 30.国b1 饗xe2, e.g. 31.h6 总c3! 32.hxg7+ \$xf7! 33.費b7+ \$f6. 29... Xb8! 30. 2b2

After 30 @d2 @a3 31 @c1 @xc1 32 #xc1 Wh6 it's curtains 30 @xb2 31.@d4 @xd1! 32.@xe6+

dovf7 White resigned in view of 33.@xc7 &c3+.

SI 19 16

☐ Romero Holmes

■ Gil Reguera La Roda 1986

1.e4 c5 2.013 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 @f6 5.@c3 a6 6.@e3 e6 7.₩d2 b5 8.f3 **Ωh7**

8...b4 9.@ce2 d5 10.e5 @fd7 11.f4 &c5 is also playable, as is 8...@e7 or 8...@bd7.

9.a4 b4 After 9 h6 White can choose between

10.0-0-0 and 10 h4/? 10 @ce2 d521

10...e5 may be better. In the game Hector-

Ornstein, Swedish championship 1986, there followed 11.@f5 g6 12.\@xb4?!\@c7 13.\@g5 公bd7 14.公fg3 d5 15.營c3 營b6 16.0-0-0 基c8 17. ₩d3 ②c5 18. ₩d2 ②a4, with good play for Black

11.a5!

This is stronger than 11.e5 afd7 12.f4 ac5 13. 2g3 2bd7, with roughly equal chances. 11...@fd7

11... h5 (the knight on the edge!) has drawbacks: 12.@h3 dxe4 13.fxe4 @xe4 14.\frac{1}{2}f1 g6 15.0-0-0 Qe7 16.公g3 公xg3 17.hxg3 管c7?

(17... ad5 is still unclear) 18. axe6!, with a large advantage for White: Black cannot take the bishop, Blehm-Petkevich, Cappelle la Grande 1995.

12.exd5 @xd5 13.@f4 @b7?

This is a fatal error; Black stops covering e6. White strikes immediately. According to Nikitin, White is also better after 13...@e5 14.0-0-0! âe7 15.公xd5 賞xd5 16.f4! 公c4 (16... 實xa2? is bad in view of 17 數02) 17. Qxc4 響xc4 18. 響g2, but 13... 公b6!? may be a playable option.



14.@fxe6! fxe6 15.@xe6 \a5

A later game saw 15...\wedge c8. This went wrong as well: 15... wc8 16. h3! dr7 17.g6+! hxg6 18. 2g5+ \$e8 19. 2e6 2e7 20.0-0-0 ¥c6 21. The 1 of 6 22. 2c5!, and Black resigned. Pinski-Mannke, Warsaw 1995. The point is 22... 響xc5 23. 全f7+ 雪f8 24. 響d8+, mating.

16. £h3 \$f7 16... 2e5 is met by 17.0-0-0 2bc6 18.f4, and

wins. 17.a6+!

Vacating square g5 for the knight. 17...hxq6 18.@q5+ de8 19.0-0-0 IIxh3 What else?

20. The 1! White is not interested in the h3 rook!

20... 9 e7

After 20...\$\psi d8 White had intended this: 21. £f4 £c6 22. Øf7+ \$c8 23 \$e8+ \$b7

24. 4xf8 @xf8 25 @d6+, and it's all over 21.9f4 9c6

Or 21... 学d8 22. 基xe7! 含xe7 23. 賞d6+ 会e8 24. We6+. or 21... 国h8 22. 国xe7+! 如xe7 23.\(\bar{a}\)e1+ \(\phi\)d8 24.\(\phi\)f7+ \(\phi\)c8 25.\(\phi\)d6+. 22. Exe7+! dod8

After 22. dexe7 23 Wd6+ Black will be mated in a few moves. You'll see why yourself. 23.We3 cc8 24 @xh3

24. Ie8+ cb7 25. 2f7 was the quickest win 24... wxa2 25. wd4 wa1+ 26. dd2 wa5 27.40a5

Black resigned.

SI 20 1

Shmuter ■ Obukhov

Russia 1993

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 d6 6.a4

The Keres Attack. 6...e5?! 7. û.b5+!

The situation is different from the Perenvi variation. This bishop check gives White the hetter position

7... ad7 8. axd7+ wxd7

8... Dbxd7 9. Df5 looks very bad indeed for Black.

9.9 f5 h5

After 9...g6 White can choose between 10.2e3 and 10.2e5.

10.qxh5!

10. 25 and 10.f3 are also playable, but the text is probably White's strongest option 10...@xh5

Other moves are very bad for Black: 10... axh5? 11. d5!, or 10... 0xe4? 11.@xg7+ @xg7 12.@xe4 d5 13.h6. 11 @ h6!

Earlier games had seen 11.0 d5 or 11.0 o5 but the text makes the entire line with 6 e5 more or less unplayable for Black.

11 Øc6

Other moves are no better: 11...gxh6 12. 資xh5. or 11...g6 12. axf8 gxf5 (12... 安xf8 13. wxd6+ wxd6 14. 公xd6) 13. xd6 公c6 14 @c5 in both cases with a large advantage for White

12. #xh5 q6 13. #q5 qxf5

And here 13... Ixh6 14. 2xh6 2d4 is no better: 15.0-0-0 公f3 16.實e3 實h3 17.公g8!, and wins.

14. @ xf8



14...@d4

After 14... xf8 15. €d5 or 14... xxf8 15 0-0-0! 響e6 (15 ...のd4 16.耳hg1, transposing to the game) 16.exf5! Wh6 17.h4! @d4 18, \$b1 White has a large advantage.

15.0-0-0 少xf8 16. 其hg1 we6 17. 其xd4! That knight has to go!

17...exd4 18.\@a7+ \pher 19.\0d5+ \pher d7 20.₩xd4

Thanks to the sovereign knight on d5, White has a decisive plus.

20 Thc8

White wins after both 20 h5 21 Wd3 20 fxe4 21. wa4+ 本d8 22. wa5+ and 20... wh6+ 21.4b1 (21.f4!? is also strong) 21... ag8 (21... 其hg8 22. 安a4+) 22. 其d1. A nice attempt is Ilo7 23 f3 Exh2 24 Wh6 White wins as well. 21 Wh4! Tah8 22 Wa4+ Tc6 23 Wxa7 wh6+ 24. cb1 wh8

There is nothing else. 25.9 b4 #c7 26.e5! #a8

26 b5 runs into 27 e6+! fxe6 28. wxb8! wxb8 29, ■g7+ 中c8 30. □g8+ 中b7 31. xb8+ dxb8 32. 2a6+, which leaves White with a winning pawn ending. Great emff!

27.e6+! doxe6

Or 27 fxe6 28 wxa8 wxa8 29. gg7+. 28 Wh6 Ic5 29.0 d3 Wd4 30. Wxb7 Black resigned.

SI 20.2

☐ Kotronias

■ Georgiev, Krum Karditsa 1994

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 d6 3.d4 9f6 4.9c3 cxd4 5. 2xd4 e6 6.g4 a6 7.g5 2fd7 8. 2e3 b5 For 8... 6c6, see the game Pokojowczyk-Timoschenko

9 a3 9 h7 10 h4 @ h6

Black is not great. Other moves are not really stronger: 10... ac5 11. 實g4! 公bd7 12.0-0-0 ②e5 13.實g2, or 10... êe7 11.實g4 公c6 12.0-0-0 @ce5.13 Wh3, in both cases with the better prospects for White.

11.h5 28d7



12.q6!

White sacrifices a rook to crack the black king position

Black wants to hang on to his h1 rook, but now his king is overrun by a furious assault. Relatively better is 14... \$\pi\tau1\$ 15 \$\pi\tau2\$ 5 (16...\$\pi\tau4\$ 17.\$\pi\tau2\$ bxc4 18.8.0-0 should also be very good for Whitel 17.\pi\tau6\$ \$\pi\tau6\$ 18...\$\pi\tau6\$ 19...\$\pi\tau4\$ \Quad \

15.\\a4!\\c8

The only move. After 15... 全5 16.皇g5+Black loses the queen, while after 15... 數b8 16.皇g5+全f6 17.數xe6+ 全d8 18.數e8+全c7 19.으e6 he is mated.

16. #xe6+ \$\psi d8 17. #e8+ \$\psi c7 18. \$\text{Qe6+} \$\psi c6

Or 18...\$b8 19.\(\Delta\)xf8 \(\Delta\)xf8 20.\(\Delta\)xb6 \(\Delta\)c6 21.\(\psi\)e7, winning.

19. 2d5! Exf1+

There is nothing better. 19... 響xe8 20. 公b4 mate, or 19... 全xd5 20. exd5+ 全xd5 21.0-0-0+ 全c6 22. 全g2+.

22... £xxf8 is met by 23. 其d1+ 並c4 24. 其d4+ 並c5 25. 其h4+ 並d5 26. 實e4 mate; 22... 實xe8 leads to a winning endgame for White after 23. fxe8實 基xe8 24. ②xd7 並c6 25. ②b6 基xe3 26. fxe3 並xb6 27. 其d1; and 22... 實で4+ won't help either 23. 並e1 全xf8 24. 其d1+.

23.\(\bar{L}\)d1+ \(\phi\)e4 24.\(\bar{L}\)d4+ \(\phi\)f5 25.\(\bar{L}\)f4+
Black resigned.

SI 20.5

☐ Anand ■ Ye Jiangchuan

. re Jungenue

Kuala Lumpur 1989

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 ⊕f6 5.⊕c3 d6 6.g4 h6 7.≣g1 ⊕c6 8.h4 h5 In order to parry the threat 9.g5. 9.gxh5

After 9.g5 ⊕g4 10.ŵe2 g6 11.⊕xc6 bxc6 12.ŵxg4 hxg4 13.₩xg4 ŵg7 14.ŵd2 ₩b6 Black has compensation for the pawn. 9...⊕xh5 10.ŵq5 ⊕f6

10...響b6 has also been played. After 11.包b3 White is slightly better.

11. Qe2 a6 12.h5 Qd7 13. Wd2 Qe7

The game Kasparov-Sax, Tilburg 1989, saw 13..b5 14.a3 &c7 15.&c3 ⊕xh5 16.0-0-0 £167! (stronger is 16..g6 17.f4 £2f6 18.ℤh1, with unclear play; but White does have compensation for his pawn 17.ℤxg7 變h8 18.⊕xc6 &xc6 19.變d4, with advantage for White

14.0-0-0 \c7?

Now White can start making combinations. Better was 14...b5, possibly transposing to the game Kasparov-Sax. 15.h6l axh6

15...g6 is met strongly by 16.響f4!, e.g. 16...e5 17.急xf6! exf4 18.急xh8, winning, or 16...公xd4 17.急xf6 ①xe2+ 18.②xe2, with a large advantage for White.

17.**⊕f5! ≜e**7

17...exf5 is met by 18.全d5 變d8 19.變xh6! 量xh6 20.量g8 mate. After 17...0-0-0 18.全xd6+ \$\psi\$ \$\psi White has a winning position, and 17... £e5 is simply met by 18.f4.

18. xe7 cxe7?!

19.耳g3! b5 20.脊f4! 耳ad8

Or 20...b421.e5! dxe5 22.\\$h4+\\$e8 23.\\$f6 ■f8 24.\\$h5 \\$c8 25.\\$e4 \\$d4 26.\\$xf7+!, and it's finished. Thus Anand.

21. #h4+ #e8 22. #xb5! @e5 Or 22... axb5 23. @xb5 and 24. @xd6+.

23. <u>≗</u> e2

Now White wins easily. 23...₩c5 24.Ձh5 If8 25.f4 ②c6 26.e5! d5

Or 26...dxe5 27.@e4.

27...金xf7 runs into 28.響h5+, and mate, of course.

28.耳g8+ 響f8 29.耳xf8+ 耳xf8 30.響h5+ 水e7 31.響xh6

Black resigned.

SI 20.5

☐ Sobura ■ Pieniazek

Poland 1988

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 1 f6 5.⊕c3 e6 6.g4 h6 7.h4 Another good move is 7.≣g1.

7...âe7 8.₩f3 h5

White was threatening the strong move 9.g5!. 9.gxh5 ②xh5 10.ଛg5 ②c6 11.②xc6

White has other options here as well: 11.0-0-0 âxg5+ 12.hxg5 ∰xg5+ 13.☆b1 ∴xd4 14.≣xd4 âd7 15.≣xd6 âc6 16.≣xc6 bxc6 17.e5, with compensation for the ex-

change, Ljubojevic-Timman, Montreal 1979, or 11.2b5 2d7 12.2xc6 bxc6 13.0-00. 2xg5+14.hxg5 @xg5+15.3xb1 g6 16.0:b3 @xs 17.2d2 @xs 18.e5 d5 19.2de41, with advantage for White, Kotronias-Van den Doel, Wijk aan Zee 1995.
11..bxc6 12.0-0-0 2xx65+?!

Taking this pawn is risky. 12... ■b8!? would

have been better. 13.hxq5 \wxq5+ 14.\diphb1 \diperes e7?!

3.hxg5 \wxg5+ 14.\db1 \decare e7?!

This is refuted beautifully, but it is hard to indicate a satisfactory move for Black, e.g. 14...d57 15.exd5 cxd5 16.\(\text{Lx}\) xd5! exd5! exd5 17.\(\text{Lx}\) xd5, or 14...\(\text{W}\) c5? 15.e5!.

Relatively best is 14...\(\text{W}\) e5. when White

plays 15.âe2 g6 16.₩e3!, followed by f4. 15.âe2 g6



16.星xd6! 含xd6 17.響xf7!

The point of the rook sacrifice. The black king's retreat is cut off.

17...a5

Other moves won't help either: 17...c5 18.**基**d1+ **\$\phics\$c\$** 19.**\$\phics\$b5+ \$\phics\$b\$** 20.**\$\prick\$d\$** 17...\$\$ 18.**\$\prick\$d\$** 19.**\$\phics\$b\$** 19.**\$\phics\$a4+**, or 17...**\$\pick\$f\$** 18.**\$\prick\$d\$** 14+ **\$\phics\$c\$** 19.**\$\pick\$e7**!, and White wins in all cases

18.≝d1+ **∲e**5

Or 18...全c5 19.全a4+, and mate. 19.全xh5! 互xh5 20.f4+! 響xf4 21.響g7+ Black resigned; after 21...實f6 22.響c7 he is mated. SI 20.10

☐ Pokojowczyk ■ Timoschenko

Polanica Zdroi 1979

1.e4 c5 2.6/f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.6/xd4 @f6 5.@c3 d6 6.q4 @c6 7.q5 @d7 8. \(\text{\mathbb{e}}\)e3 a6 9.h4 \(\text{\mathbb{e}}\)e7 10.\(\text{\mathbb{e}}\)d2 \(\text{\mathbb{e}}\)xd4 11. wxd4 0-0 12.0-0-0 b5 13. Ig1

Both players are looking threateningly at the enemy king. With the text White is aiming for h5 and g6. Another idea is 13.f4, when Black can play 13... wa5 14 f5 b4.

13... Tb8 14.h5 b4 15.4 d5?!

A thematic sacrifice in this kind of position: but they don't always work... 15. 2e2 is better. 15 evd5 16 h6 @e51

The correct reply! 16...f6? is bad: 17.\psyxd5+ 算f7 18.e6! hxe6 19.實xf7+! 如xf7 20.gc4+ \$68 21 h7.

17.f4 \(\psi\) c7! 18.exd5

Other moves are no better, e.g. 18.fxe5 dxe5 19. 實xd5 ae6, or 18. hxg7 基d8 19. fxe5 dxe5 20.誊a7 要xa7 21.盒xa7 草b7, in both cases with good play for Black.

18... £f5! 19. Eg2 Efc8 20. Edd2 b3! 21.axb3 Ixb3 22.dd1

White still cannot safely win back his piece: 22.fxe5 dxe5 23.豐a7 豐a5 24.豐xa6 基xc2+! 25.基xc2 響e1 mate!



22...@f6!

A very nice one!

23.cxb3

The point of Black's previous move is that 23.gxf6 is met strongly by 23... (2)f3! 24. Exg7+ ch8.

23... wc1+ 24. de2 @f3! 25. wb4

25.鬱a4!? may be better, but after the game the refutation 25...@xd2 26.@xd2 @d3+ 27 dovd3 響vf1+28 目e2 @vb2 29 響e4 @a3! was found. Black is better

25... IIe8! 26. 4xf3

26.gxf6 is met by 26...\#e1+, and wins. 26... wxf1+ 27. af2 wh1 28. aq1

The white king has straved far away from home and is in terrible trouble. A few other variations: 28.gxf6 實h5+29.gg3 實h3 mate. or 28.2g3 g6! 29.gxf6 2g4+! 30.4xg4 Wh5 mate. or 28.2a7 Wh5+ 29.2c3 Wg4+ 30. 少f2. Wh4+ 31. 少f3 &e4+ 32. Wxe4 Wh5+ 33 也e3 學h3+!

28... 省h3+ 29. 国q3 省f1+ 30. 国f2 国e3+!

A nice final move! White resigned in view of 31 dove3 Wd3 mate

SI 20.13

☐ Movsesian

■ Cvitan

German Bundesliga 1997

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 @f6 5.@c3 d6 6.q4 @c6 7.q5 @d7 8 4e3 4e7 9 h4 0-0 10 Wh5!? a6 11.0-0-0 @xd4

In order to be able to play ... b5. 12. axd4 b5 13. ad3 @e5

13...b4? is refuted by 14.2d5! exd5 15.Qxg7! \$\prightarrow\$xg7 16.\prightarrow\$h6+ \$\prightarrow\$g8 17.exd5 f5 18.gxf6 e.p. @xf6 19.\pihg1+, and mate.

This move is still not good. A better option is 16... 實c7!. 17. 實h6 is met by 17...e5 18.fxe5 dxe5. After 17.f5 Black plays 17...b4 18.f6 c5. and holds his own, e.g. 19.fxe7 \wxe7 20 公d5 @xd5 21.exd5 exd4 22.實g4 耳fe8 23 Wxd4 a5. After 17.0\d5 &xd5 (but not 17...exd5? 18.星c3! 管d8 19.星cg3, and White wins as in the game) 18,exd5 e5 19.2e3 exf4 20. Qxf4 響c4 21.響f3 耳fc8 22.耳g2 響xa2 23. 耳a3 響c4 24. 草e2 White has compensation for the nawn, but Black is still fully in the game. Thus, in a nutshell, the analysis by the Scottish grandmaster Motwani

17 @d5[exd5

Black has to take the knight because of the devastating threat 18.2f6+! &xf6 19.gxf6 vxe4 20. Wh6, and mate. Capturing the knight with the bishon is no better: 17... &xd5 18.exd5 ≣e8 19.dxe6 fxe6 20.@xg7! dxg7 21. Wh6+ dg8 22.g6, and Black might as well resign.



18 IIda3

It is still too early for 18. who: 18...gxh6 19.gxh6+ 全g5 20. 其xg5+ 實xg5. 18...wc7

After 18. \$\diph\$ White plays 19.g6 fxg6 20. Exg6 &f6 21. Exg7!, and mate, while 18... Ze8 is met by 19.g6! fxg6 20. Zxg6 hxg6 21. 實xg6 息f6 22. 泉xf6. Thus Motwani's analysis.

19 Wh6!

Now this beautiful move is decisive. 19...wxc2+

The only way: Black opens an escape route

for his king. But he comes too late to rescue the game

20. \$\psi xc2 \pi fc8+ 21. \$\psi d2 gxh6 22.gxh6+

Again no choice... 23.1xq5+ \$f8 24.exd5 \$e7 25.1f5!

25... \$\mathbb{I}\$ g8 26.\$\mathbb{I}\$ e1+ also loses. 26. dd3 Eac8 27. Eq7 Black resigned.

SI 20.13

□ Nunn

■ Thorsteins

Lugano 1989

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 Ø f6 5.Ø c3 d6 6.q4 ≜e7 A laconic reply. Black gives White a free

hand. But the move is not had. 7.a5 @fd7 8.h4 0-0 9.2e3 @c6 10.2c4

A good developing move, although 10.\dd2 and 10 Wh5 are worth considering, especially the latter - see the game Movsesian-Cvitan! 10...@xd4

10... 2b6!? 11. âb3 d5!? looks more logical. 11 Wvd4 a62!

Now White can quietly continue his kingside action; Black's counterplay on the other wing won't develop quickly enough. Nunn has indicated 11. 公e512 12. ge2 公c6 13.費d2 a6

as stronger. 12 0-0-0 b5 13 @ b3 @ c5?!

Black would have been better advised to leave the knight on d7, but 13... \Bb8 14.h5! \@xg5 15 h6 would also have been very good for White, e.g. 15...gxh6 (15... £f6 16. wxd6) 16. Adg1 e5 17. Axh6! exd4 18. axg5 \wxg5+ 19. axg5+ ch8 20. 2d5.

14.f4 wa5 15.h5! b4 16.h6 e5

The only move, in fact; but White had prepared an exceptionally beautiful reply. 17.9 d5!

Bad is 17 fxe5?! dxe5 18 ₩xe5? @xb3+ of course, and White loses his queen, But the text launches a winning attack. The queen sacrifice is undoubtedly correct.

17...@xb3+

17...exd4 is met by 18. 2xe7+ \$\preceph{8}\$ 19.hxg7+ \$\psi_xg7 20.\hat{k}xd4+ f6 21.gxf6+ \psi_xf6 22.\psidg1+ \$\psi f8 23.\pi g8+ \psi xe7 24.\pi xh7+ \pi f7 25.\pi xf7 mate!

18.axb3 [♠] xq5

A desperate attempt to prevent the inevitable. Taking the queen still loses: 18...exd4 19. 2xe7+ \$\displant n8 20. 2xd4 f6 21.g6 \$\docume{\pi}\$g8 22.hxg7+ \$\pixg7 23.\bar{a}xh7+ \$\pif8 24.\bar{a}f7+ \$\pie8 25. @xg8.

19.fxe5!

Now White could no longer sacrifice the queen: 19.fxg5? exd4 20.@e7+ \$\text{\$\phi\$}h8 21 @xd4 @xe5+

19... £xe3+

Or 19 dve5 20 @ve5 @ve3+ 21 dbl 20. wxe3 q6 21. wq5 f6 22. Qe7+ cf7

The game is over, 22... \$\delta h8\$ would have run into 23.6)x96+, but after the text White wins the queen.

23.e6+

Black resigned.

SI 21.3

☐ De Firmian ■ Yudasin

Manila 1990

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4

A rather strange idea in this position; 8... 2c6 looks more logical.

9.皇e2! 皇g7 10.皇e3 響c7

10... wxb2? is very bad. White simply goes 11.\$\d2, threatening to win the queen with 12 Thb1

11.0-0-0 0-0 12.q4! 40c6

After 12...e5 De Firmian has indicated 13.g5!? (13.0f5!? may also be good) 13...exd4 14.gxf6 dxc3 15.fxg7 cxb2+ 16.\$\dot{\pi}b1 \$\mathbb{\pi}e8\$ 17.f5!?, with advantage for White.

13.f5 @d7

In the later game Adams-Renet, Cannes 1992, Black tried 13... Ee8, but after 14.g5 ②d7 15.f6 âf8 16.h4 ②de5 17.實h3 b5 18.h5 he had a miserable position.

14.互hf1 公ce5 15.實g3 互e8 16.費h4 b5 17. £h6 £h8?

Now White has a winning combination, and

not such a hard one either Even top grandmasters like Yudasin can lose track of things when the pressure is piled on... But 17... wd8 18. wh3 @h8 19.fxe6 fxe6 20.262. De Firmian, would have given White a very good position as well, while 17... £f6 could be met strongly by 18.2g5!? (or 18.g5 @h8 19.fxg6 fxg6 20.\frac{\psi}{14}, e.g. 18...\delta xg5+ 19. wxg5 ab7 20. wh6 sh8 21. g5 国ac8 22. \$\bullet{\pi}\$f4, with attacking threats.

18.fxe6 fxe6



19 @ ye6! wh7

Instead of resigning... 19... Exe6 is answered by 20.2d5 was 21.2e7+, and the game is

20. 2d5 2f6 21. 2ec7 2xg4 22. 2xe8 @xe2 23.@exf6+ @xf6 24 Wxf6 Black resigned.

SI 21.3

☐ Sax

■ Wojtkiewicz

Debrecen 1992

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 66 5.6c3 a6 6.f4 e6 7.₩f3 ₩b6 8.a3 ¢ c6 9.€b3 ₩c7 10.q4 b5 11.q5 €d7

Both players are developing their pieces.

White is already preparing a kingside attack in case Black castles kingside.

13 @d3 @c5

13...b4!? may well be eminently playable. 14 0-0 @xb3

With 14...@xd3 Black can swap White's attacking bishop, but then 15.cxd3 strengthens the white centre. White will then attack the black position with 16 f5

15 cxb3 @e7

15...g6 has been suggested as an improvement. 16 Wh3 0-02

This is a bit too careless. Had Black underestimated White's reaction? 16...g6 17.f5 @e5 18 fxe6 @xd3 (18 fxe6 19 Wxe6 @xd3 20 0 d5 @xd5 21 @xd5) 19 exf7+ \$d8 20 @d4 @e5 21 @xe5 dxe5 22 #ad1+ would also have favoured White, but maybe 16... Wd7 was playable - away from the c-file!



17 @d5l exd5

17... 響d8 is strongly met by 18.e5. 18.exd5 q6 19.\(\max\)ac1!

This causes trouble for Black along the c-file. 19... Tae8

19... Tac8 is met by 20, 2e4!.

20 dxc6

Now Black would have had the saving 20...@xg5 after 20.@e4?.

20 ... 0 xc6 21.f5!

Again, 21, &e4? was less good, this time in view of 21 Wd7! But the text leads to a simnle win

21... 2d8 22. Wh6

Black resigned. After 22...f6, 23.fxg6 hxg6 24 Exc6 wins

SI 21 3

☐ Sideif Zade

■ Gofshtein

Aktiubinsk 1985

1 e4 c5 2 0 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4.0 xd4 @f6 5.@c3 e6 6.f4 a6 7.@f3 @b6 8.@b3

For 8,a3, see the game De Firmian-Yudasin. 8...\@c7

After 8...@c6 9.&e3 @c7 10.g4 b5 11.g5 2d7 12.0-0-0 White also has slightly better prospects.

9.q4!? b5 10.q5 @fd7

10...b4 may also be playable, e.g. 11.2b5 axb5 12.gxf6 gxf6 13.@xb5+ @d7 14.f5 ₩b6, with an unclear position, Gipslis-Van Welv. Gausdal 1992. 11 a e 3 h 4

Other reasonable possibilities are 11... \$b7 and 11. @b6.

12.9 e2 9b7 13.0-0-0 9 c6

13... 2c5 has been suggested as an improvement here, but after 14 @xc5 dxc5 15 f5 e5 16.f6 g6 17.@h3 @c6 18. ad2 Black had an awkward position in the game Delchev-Orsag, Andorra 1996.

14 @ed4 @c521

14... Ic8!? may be a stronger move.

15. €xc5 €xd4

15...dxc5 is met by 16.⊕b3, followed by 17...c4, and Black has no counterplay.

16. axd4 dxc5 17. ac5 ₩c6

After 17... \$\psi a5 18.\text{\text{\text{a}}}c4\$ Black is completely beyond in

18. £c4!

A very strong pawn sacrifice. 18...\www.we4 19.\www.b3! \www.f3

19... 直d8 is followed by 20. 重de1 響f3 21. 盒xe6 響xb3 22. 盒xb3 毫xh1 23. 盒a4+ 重d7 24. 盒xg7+, and Black is lost.

20. 2xe6! #xb3

After 20...fxe6, 21.\(\mathbb{w}\)ee 423.\(\mathbb{g}\)he 1 wins. But swapping the queens won't save Black either. His king is too exposed.

21.\(\mathbb{w}\)hat 3.\(\mathbb{w}\)hi 12.\(\mathbb{e}\)a4+!\(\mathbb{e}\)ee 7.23.f5!



23...¤d8

Black is a rook up, and yet he is lost! 23...f6 24.\(\bar{\pma}\) 47+ \(\pma\)e8 25.\(\bar{\pma}\)gxf6 26.\(\bar{\pma}\)gxf6 \(\bar{\pma}\)h6+6+27.\(\bar{\pma}\)b1 \(\bar{\pma}\)g 28.\(\bar{\pma}\)gxh7+\(\pma\)f8 29.\(\bar{\pma}\)e7 mate, and 23...\(\bar{\pma}\)a7 24.\(\bar{\pma}\)d6+\(\pma\)d8 25.\(\bar{\pma}\)xc5+cannot save him.

24.⊑e1! ≗d5

Or 24...f6 25.\(\hat{L}\)xf6++ \(\psi\)f7 26.\(\hat{L}\)xd8.
25.\(\hat{L}\)xg7+

Black resigned; after 25...\$\psi 6 26.\textre{\textre{\textrice}}\textre{\textre{\textrice}}\textre{\textre{\textre{\textrice}}}\textre{\textre{\textre{\textre{\textrice}}}}\textre{\textrice}}\textre{\textre{\textre{\textrice}}}\textre{\textrice}}\textre{\textre{\textre{\textrice}}}\textre{\textrice}}\textre{\textri

SI 21 5

□ Poliantsev

■ Foigel

Beltsi 1979 1.e4 c5 2.心f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.心xd4 公f6 5.心c3 a6 6.≗e3 e6 7.f4 b5 8.變f3 息b7 9.≗d3 心bd7 10.g4 h6

Another option is 10...b4 11.全ce2 e5 (11...全c5 12.全g3 響c7) 12.全b3 d5, with an unclear position. 10...全c5 has also been played.

11.0-0-0 Ec8 12.q5?!

Too optimistie! The text hands Black square e5, and White turns out to be powerless on the kingside. By way of an exception, the black king is safe on e8. A better possibility is 12.0e2 0e5 13.0g3, with roughly equal prospects.

ver gets around to it. Stronger is 16.\(\Delta\)ce2 \(\Delta\)e7 17.\(\hat{h3}\) \(\Delta\)xd3+ 18.\(\Delta\)xd3, although Black is better after 18.\(\Delta\)ce5, Lanc-Mokry, Tmava 1984.

16.\(\Delta\)e7 17.\(\hat{h4}\)

After 17.h3 Black would have played 17...

xg5.

17...

ya5



18. ≜e2

18.a3 bxa3 19.@xa3 d5 is also good for Black.

18... wxa2 19.b3

Winning the piece backfires: 19.\(\hat{\omega}\)xg4? \(\hat{\omega}\)c3 bxc3 21.\(\hat{\omega}\)xc3 \(\bar{\omega}\)al+, and the white king is doomed.

19...公f2! 20.資xf2 皇xe4 21.皇c4 至xc4! 22.bxc4?!

This loses at once. With 22.2xe5 dxe5 23.bxe4 White could still have put up something of a fight, even though the position after 23..xe4d 24.8h2 0-0 (maybe 24..2xd6) is even stronger) 25.8xe4d 26.8 will probably lose as well: Black has overwhelming compensation for the exchange he is down.

22. 4 xc4

White resigned. After 23.置dgl 总xhl 24.置xhl 響b2+ 25.ddl 響xbl+ 26.息cl 总xg5! jt's curtains.

SI 21.7

☐ Spraggett ■ Arakhamia

Bern 1995

1.e4 c5 2.全f3 全c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.全xd4 e6 5.全c3 d6 6.全e3 全f6 7.f4 a6 8.豐f3 豐c7 9.0-0-0 全e7 10.單g1

10.g4 may be followed by 10...€\xd4 11.\(\text{x}\)4d e5 12.\(\text{k}\)e5 dxe5 (but preferably not 21...\(\text{x}\)gy 42! in view of 13.\(\text{w}\)gy 3 dxe5 14.\(\text{x}\)gy 88 15\(\text{g}\)gy!, with advantage for White 13.\(\text{w}\)gy 3\(\text{d}\)64 \(\text{x}\)65 3\(\text{x}\)gy 5 4xb5 16.\(\text{x}\)b5 \(\text{w}\)65 17.\(\text{x}\)65 4\(\text{x}\)65 3\(\text{x}\)5

h5, with an unclear position.

You'd wonder whether it is wise to allow the white bishop free access to the long diagonal – see the diagrammed position below! But after, for example, 11...\(\phi_2\)d7 White will also launch an attack with 12.85 b5 13.\(\pi_1\)b.

12. â xd4 b5

12...e5 weakens the d5 square too much: 13.盒e3 ext4 14.g5! 包含 15.包d5 包e5 16.實x4 實d8 T2.86 實d7 18.全f6+! 兔xf6 19.gxf6, and White is winning, Felicio-Roca, correspondence game 1996.

13.a5 @d7 14.Eq3!

14.f5 also looks strong, but the text is very direct: White simply threatens 數h5 and 真h3.

14... ⊑d8 15.₩h5 b4

After 15...g6? it is mate: 16.豐xh7+! \$\psixh7\$
17.从\$\pi\$3.\$\phi\$8 18.从\$\pi\$8, and 15...②\$\pi\$8 is followed by the winning 16.f5!, with the threat of 17.\pi\$xg7!, which 16...exf5 fails to parry: 17.\pi\$xg7\$\$\pi\$\$7 18.\pi\$f6+!



16.@xq7! @xq7

After 16...bxc3 17.\(\frac{1}{2}\) 17.\(\frac{1}{2}\) 2.\(\frac{1}{2}\) 8 18.\(\frac{1}{2}\) 19.\(\frac{1}{2}\) xc3 e5 20.\(\frac{1}{2}\) 8 yc4 21.\(\frac{1}{2}\) 3 \(\frac{1}{2}\) 4 23.\(\frac{1}{2}\) 3 \(\frac{1}{2}\) 8 xg3 24.\(\frac{1}{2}\) xg5 \(\frac{1}{2}\) 8 yg4 25.\(\frac{1}{2}\) 6 the same is over Thus Spraggett's analysis.

17.f5 bxc3 18.₩h6+!

Less clear is 18.f6+?! 公f8 19.豐xh7 公e8!. 18...公h8 19.里h3 皇xg5+

Black's only option, as 19... of8 is met by 20.f6, and mate.

20.₩xg5 cxb2+

21. ab1 直g8 22. wh4 直g7?!

More stubbom was 22...♀f8; after 23.₩f6+ 且g7 24.且g3 ♀g6 25.fxg6 fxg6 26.且xd6! ₩xd6 27.且d3 ₩xd3 28.♠xd3 White is better, but he will still have to pull the win out of the fire

23.f6 ②xf6 24.₩xf6 âb7 25.e5! ₩d8 After 25...dxe5 26.≣g3 ≣g8 27.≣xg7 ≣xg7 28.≣d8+ it` all over, while 25...âe4 26.âd3

26. âd3! Now it is no longer difficult.

Black resigned.

SI 21.11

☐ Mokry ■ Veingold

Manila Olympiad 1992

White does not want to without his bishop, but the moves 10.黉el and 10.龄l have also been played.

10...₩b6+

10...d5 11.e5 ⊕e4 at once is also possible, e.g. 12.a3 ⊕xe3 13.bxe3 ⊕e6 14.Ձd3 ೩d7 15.⊈h1 f5, with an approximately equal position, Markovic-Cvetkovic, Sremska Mitrovica 1990. 11.⊈h1 d5 12.e5 ⊕e4 13.a3 ⊕xc3

14.bxc3 ⊕a6
The knight could also simply have returned to c6: 14...⊕c6 15.âd3 f5, with a roughly equal

position.

Back to its old spot! 15...分c5 16.总e3 安c7

It is inconceivable that Black has overlooked

the bishop sacrifice on h7, so he must have provoked it on purpose in the expectation that this time it would not be winning. If Black plays correctly, the sacrifice will probably not win, but before long we see Black slipping up. 16...15 would in any case have been safer.



17.2xh7+! \$xh7 18.0a5+ 2xa5?

The critical move is 18... \$\phi_2\$(st after 10 \(\)

19...g6 is more stubborn, but 20.₩g4 №4 21.₩h4+ &g8 22.&d4 ₩g7 23.፱f6, followed by 24.፱af1, has to be good for White. 20.₩h5+ &g8 21.፱f3 ₩xe5

21... ②xe5 is met by 22. 星h3 f6 23. 實h7+ 空f7 24.gxf6, and wins. 22. ②d4 實f5

After 22... wd6 23. In 3 f6 24.g6 it's finished.
23. In 15 exf5 exf5 24. In 1 a5 25. In 2 In 8
26.g6

Black resigned.

SI 22 6

☐ Hjartarson

■ Timman

10. \(\overline{a}\)e3 is more common, but White is leaving the bishop on c1 for the moment.

10...響c7 11.公xc6

Nothing out of the ordinary, 11.a4 is usually played here, but 11.g4, and even 11.e5, have also been tried.

11...bxc6 12. 2a4 a5! 13.c4 ≜a6 14.b3 d5!

Black already has a good position.
15.e5 公d7 16.響c2 公c5 17.公xc5 皇xc5
18 四d1 變b6 19 皇d2 四d8?!

An inaccuracy. Now White suddenly springs to life and equalises the game. After 19...g6! Black is not bad.



20.f5! dxc4

SI 23 1

☐ Morgado

Kletsel

Correspondence game 1982 1 e4 c5 2 ⊘f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊘xd4

②f6 5. ②c3 a6 6. ②e3 e6 7. ②e2 ∰c7 8.f4 b5 9. ②f3 ②b7 10.e5 Sharp play, 10.a3 is a calmer continuation.

Sharp play. 10.a3 is a calmer continuation. 10...dxe5 11.总xb7 wxb7

Here I L_exd4!? is a very good alternative, after 12.axa8 dxc3 Black has compensation for the exchange, e.g. 13.wf3 aa3! 14.公d1 axb2 15.cxb2 wc3+ 16.xf1?! (a better move is 16.xe2, although 16..wf2-17.xe3 wxb2 18.ahb1 wc3+ 19.xf2 wd4+ 20.xf1 0-0 is probably not bad for Black then) 16..wf2-17.xe1 0-0, with advantage for Black, Palac-V.Gurevich, Pula 1994.

12.fxe5 @fd7 13.0-0



13...b4?!

Now White gets good prospects. Equally dubious, according to the white player, is the winning the pawn with 13... 2xe5?! in view of 14. 響h5 夕g6 15. 響h3!. An alternative is 13 &e7 or 13. Oc6 in order to make up for Black's lag in development.

14 wh5!

After 14. 2a4?! Black can probably afford to play 14...@xe5. With the text. White makes a promising piece sacrifice.

14...g6 15. Wh3 bxc3



16. #xf7! cxb2

Bad is 16... 如xf7? 17. 對xe6+ 如g7 18. ②f5+! gxf5 19.2h6, mate; but 16... #d5!? is a possibility and after 17 #af1 things are unclear.

Ĩe8 White can meet 19... 2xd4 with 20. gxd4! @c6.21. Wd5, and Black is in insurmountable

difficulties. 20. ch1!

A subtle move. Less clear is 20,e6?! We4! 21. 2g5+ 2c8 22.exd7+ @xd7.

20...Exe5

Other moves are not satisfactory for Black either: 20 @xe5 21 @g5+, or 20 @xd4 21. Ixh7. Variations by White.

21 @e6+ Tye6 22 Wye6 @ye3 23 Wye3 Now an important point of White's 20th move is revealed: Black cannot swap queens with Wh6

23 Wd5 24 Ee7! @f6

Or 24 doc7 25 c4 wxc4 26 we5+ 25.Ie5 Wb7 26.Id1+ 9bd7 27.Wc5

₩a7

Or 27 b1 實 28 實f8+ 少c7 29 草c5+ 少xc5 30 Wd6+ sbc8 31 Wd8 mate!

28 Wc6

Black resigned.

SI 23 4

☐ Smyslov

■ Grigorian

Moscow 1976 1.e4 c5 2.9f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 Øf6 5.Øc3 a6 6. 9e2 e6 7.0-0 ₩c7 8.f4 @bd7 9.a4 b6 10 @f3 @b7 11.\@e2 e5?!

A somewhat dubious move. Preventing the advance e4-e5 has no priority in this position (vet). Better is simply 11...@e7. 12.0 d5! 0 xd5

After 12 We5 White plays 13 b4 with the point of 13 \wxd4+? 14 \&e3 and he wins the queen: 14... #b2 15. #fb1.

13.exd5 a6 14.42c6 & a7 15.fxe5 42xe5 15...dxe5 could be followed by 16.d6 (or simnly 16 &e3 0-0 17 @c4) 16... @xd6 17. @xe5 ₩xe5 18 ₩xe5+ Øxe5 19.@xb7 \$a7 20. 2d5, with the better prospects for White. 16 @xe5 @xe5

16...dxe5 17.d6! 費d7 18.âh6! is very good for White.

17. ₽ h6 f6

Building a hidey-hole for the king on f7; a strong reply to 17 0-0-0 could have been 18 製作2 @xb2 19 重a2 @c3 20 重b1 @a5 21. ke3.

18.c4 \$f7 19.@q4 @c8 20.@xc8 Taxc8?

Black is completely unsuspecting... Necessa-after 21 &e3 Te8 22 Wd3 Th8 23 Ta2 and 24.b3.



21. 1xf6+!

This bull's eye wins at once. 21...\$xf6

21... axf6 is met by 22. we6, mate. 22.肾q4!

A beautiful silent move to demonstrate the point. The king is caught. 22... wc5+ 23. sh1 se7 24. ag5+

Black resigned.

SI 24.2

Lasker ■ Pirc

Moscow 1935

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 @c6 3 d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 66 5 @c3 d6 6 @e2 e6 7.0-0 a6 8 @e3 Wc7 9 f4 @a521

It is of vital importance, also - or particularly in the Sicilian, to follow the general rules to the letter. In this situation, for instance, the wise ontion for Black is to finish his development with 9 \$e7 and 10 0-0 before attempting anything else.

10.f5 @c4?!

10...@e7 is still better. 11. 0 xc4 Wxc4 12.fxe6 fxe6?

Now White already has a forced win! Black's only move was 12... xe6, after which White is better because of the backward d6 pawn.



Other king moves are no better: 14...\$\d7

15 WF7+ @e7 16 @f5! #e8 17 #d1 d5 18 @xd5 or 14 de7 15 @f5+!exf5 16 @d5+ sbd8 17 @b6+ sbd7 18 響f7+ sbc6 19 響c7+

15 Wf7 0 d7

Or 15... @e7 16.0 f5 #e8 17.0 xd6 @xd6 18. 9b6+ 9c7 19. Id1+, and mate.

16. Wxf6+ **©c7** 17. Wxh8 ≙h6 18 @xe6+! #xe6 19.#xa8 @xe3+ 20 do h1

Black resigned.

SI 24 8

Reinderman

Arlandi

Mondariz 2000

1.e4 c5 2.913 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 ∮ 16 5. ∮ c3 d6 6. å e2 a6 7.0-0 å e7 8.a4 © c6 9. 0 e3 0-0 10 f4 @ c7 11. Φh1 II e8 Kasparov's favourite continuation

12 a5

This remarkable plan was first used by Alexander Goloschapov from the Ukraine during the 1997 Junior world championship, and is, apparently, a brainchild of Nikitin, Kasparov's former trainer

12 @ va5 13 e5 @d5?

A serious error. In order to avoid getting into

trouble. Black should also have accepted the second pawn. After 13...dxe5 14.fxe5 \widetilde{w}xe5 15 @f4 響c5 16 @a4 響a7 17 @c7 (17.@e3!? is another possibility) the black king find itself in hot water but with 17 b5 or 17 @c6 Black can sacrifice an exchange to gain some measure of freedom, 17,...&d8? 18,&xd8 axd8 19.€ b5! however, is deadly; the mating threat on the bottom rank forced Black to resign in Zelcic-Vismara Bled 2001



14.9 xe6!

This sneaky combination, which has already claimed numerous victims, is based on the fact that the a5 knight is not covered.

14...\@xe6

The double attack after 14...fxe6 15.@xd5 exd5 16 \psycd5+ \psih8 17.\pixa5 works because 17... êe6 is refuted by 18. 響xe6! 響xa5 19 @d3 dxe5 20 @b6! 變d2 21 變f5.

15 @yd5 @yd5 16 ₩yd5 @c6 One of the stem games saw 16...b5? 17.e6 fxe6 18. wxe6+ &h8 19. 2h5 1-0. Goloschapov-Karner, Zagan 1997.

17. @ c4!

This assault on f7 is stronger than the direct 17.e6?! &f6!, and Black has counterplay. 17...dxe5

Practice has shown that it is almost impossible to defend f7 satisfactorily, e.g. 17...\[\bar{\pi} f8 18.e6! or 17....全f8 18.全b6 響d7 19.罩ad1 (19.2c5; 19.c3) 19...@b4 (thus far Yu Shaoteng-Ding Linlin, Tianjin 2001), and here 20 省a5! is strong

After 17...@d8 Volokitin indicates 18. ad1 罩c8 19. âb3 dxe5 20.fxe5 âf8 21. 響d7 響xd7 22 Exd7 Exe5 23. ab6, with advantage for White

18. wxf7+ 少h8 19. ad3! wd6

The peace offering 19...e4 20.@xe4 @d6 is of little use: 21.\#f5! g6 22.\#f6+ \#g7 23. 資xg7+ \$xg7 24. 算a4.

20. @xh7!

The final blow. The black king position is dismantled

20 dbxh7

Refusing the offer also loses, as the result of several games has shown: 20... #h6 21.2d3 @h4 22 f5! Wxe3 23.f6 @xf6 24. Ixf6 1-0. Yakovenko-Voitsekhovsky. Moscow 2000. The endgame after 20... If8 21. Wh5 Wh6 22. wxh6 gxh6 23. 2e4 exf4 24. Ixf4 Ixf4 25. axf4 (Mkrtchian-Peng, Varna 2002) is utterly hopeless.

21. If3 @h4 22. Ih3 wf6 23. wh5+ wh6 24. wa4 wa8 25. Exh4 wf6 26.f5 e4 27.If1 @e5 28.Wh5 Iac8 29.2g5 Black resigned.

SI 24 8

☐ Glek

■ Savchenko

Paris 2000

1 e4 c5 2 0 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 0 xd4 ♠ f6 5.♠ c3 a6 6.♠e2 e6 7.0-0 ♠e7 8.f4 ₩c7 9.a4 0 c6 10.âe3 0-0 11.\$h1 Ie8 12. © a1

Besides 12.a5, White can also play 12.We1, 12 Wd2 12 @d3 or 12 @f3: a wide choice.

12 Th8

And Black can also play 12...@xd4, 12...@b4 or 12... 2f8 here, all of them reasonable moves. 13. 0 d3 0 d7

In the game Glek-Ulibin, Vienna 1998, there followed 13 @b4.14 Wel @d7.15.a5 Tbc8 16 We3 @c6 17 Wh3 @f8 18 Ef3 @xd3 19.cxd3 2d7 20.g4, and White had good attacking chances.

14.對f3 @xd4?!

This swap is slightly dubious. See also the game Spraggett-Arakhamia, SI 21.7, Maybe

15 @ xd4 @ c6

After 15 e5 16 fxe5 dxe5 Glek has indicated the strong 17.@d5!, e.g. 17...@xd5?! (17... wd6 is met by 18. ac3) 18. wxf7+ ch8 19.exd5 ag4 (after 19 ... exd4 20. 響h5 it's finished at once) 20.2f5! exd4 (or 20.2f8 21 @xe5 Exf7 22 @xc7 @xf5 23 @xb8 @xd3 24.cxd3, with a winning endgame) 21. #g5! e6 22.@xg6! @xg5 23.\\xe0 xc7 hxg6 24.\\gammag3. and White wins.

16.a5 @d7?!

Taking away the knight from the kingside is pretty risky. Better was 16... \$\mathbb{L}\$bc8, when 17. #g3 is good for White, e.g. 17...d5 18. a.e.5 質d8 19. Ifd1, according to Glek,

17.微h3 分c5?

And this quickly has fatal consequences for Black. He should have played 17...h6. followed by 18,f5 (or else 18, \$\Bar{\pi}\$f3!?, 18.\$\Dd5!?, or 18.g4!?; White has an abundance of attacking ideas!) 18...&f6 19.fxe6 fxe6 20.&xf6 @xf6 21. 其xf6!? gxf6 22. 實xh6 實g7 23. 實f4 算bd8 24. If I, and the white attack continues, Glek. 18.f5! &f8



19. @ xq7!

A fine sacrifice that wins by force. 19...\$xq7

Or 19... \$\textit{a}\$xg7 20.f6 \$\textit{a}\$f8 21.\$\textit{\textit{B}}\$f4 h6 22.\$\textit{\textit{B}}\$g4+ \$\delta\$h8 (22...\$\delta\$h7 is also met by 23.實g3) 23. wg3, and Black might as well resign. 20.f6+ \$\psi h8 21.\$\pi f4 h6 22.\$\pi h4 \$\pi h7 23.q4! \$\psiq6

After 23...e5 White plays 24.g5 De6 25.其xh6+ 全xh6 26.費xh6+ 安g8 27.公d5 費d7 (or 27...費d8 28.g6) 28.其g1 b5 29.其g3. and wins. Glek.

24.¤f1

Black resigned. It is all over bar the shouting, e.g. 24...@xd3 25.g5 (or 25.\pixh6+ \hat{o}.xh6 26. 對h5+ 由h7 27.g5) 25...hxg5 26. 其h8.

SI 24.11

□ Balinov ■ Krageli

Bled 1999

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 9c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 ₩c7 5.0 c3 e6 6.0 e2 a6 7.0-0 0 f6 8.0 e3 ûe7 9.f4 d6 10.₩e1 0-0 11.₩q3 @xd4 11... Ad7 is another much-played move.

12 9 vd4 b5 13 a3 9 b7 14 Tae1 9 c6 15.âd3 e5

This move is a well-known way to equalise in this position. But here White has a trick up his steeve! Another interesting line is 15...@h5 16.費h3 e5 (Black switches the moves around!), but this is followed by 17. wxh5 exd4 18.0 d5 axd5 19.exd5 g6 20.實h6 算fe8 21.f5 点f8 22. Exe8 Exe8 23. 實f4, with advantage for White, according to an analysis by the Chinese grandmaster Wang Zili). But after 15...公h5 16.響h3 a good possibility might be 16...のxf4!?: 17.買xf4 e5 18.買g4 exd4 19.響h6 g6 20. Eg3 dxc3 21. Eh3 @h4 22. Exh4 f6, with an unclear position. Kasparov and Nikitin.

16.fxe5 @h5 17.exd6!?

After simply 17. ₩h3 dxe5 18. £e3 g6 the position is roughly equal.

No stronger is 19... Ife8 20. \$\pm\$xf1 \ \textbf{I} \textbf{Iac8} (now 20... \textbf{xxf1} \textbf{igoof for White: } 21.exd5 \textbf{\textbf{g}}\text{cof} \textbf{2} \textbf{xc7} \text{22.} \textbf{xc8} \text{4.exf5} \textbf{1} \text{xc7} \text{25... \text{cc7} \text{xc7} \text{2c7} \text{2.exf} \text{2.exf} \text{2.exf} \text{xc7} \text{2.exf} \text{2.exf} \text{xc7} \text{2.exf} \text{

20.exd5 &d6 21.&e5 ■fe8 After 21...&xe5 22. ■xe5 @d2, 23.d6 wins,

e.g. 23... ac8 24. af5 or 23... a7 24. ac5. 22. axd6 axe1 23. af2

23.单b4? 包d2+ 24.每f2 罩e5 is good for Black.

23...Id1



24. ŵ c5!

Carlsson-Bjuhr, correspondence game 1995, saw 24.£47 Zxd3: 25.cxd3 &78 Z6.\$xf1 & \$x6.\$xf1 & \$x6.\$xf2 & \$x6.\$xf2 & \$x6.\$xf3 & \$x6.\$xf

24...@xh2 25.\pa3! @f1+ 26.\pf4

Black resigned. Ānd his position has to be lost: 26...量e1 27.d6 g5+ 28.歩f3 ②d2+ 29.歩f2 星e8 30.৯b61, or 26...g5+ 27.歩xg5 f6+ (or 27...量e1 28.歩f4 ②g3 29.歩xg3 量e5

30.&b4!) 28.\$\pixf6 \Delta g3 (or 28...\$\mathbb{Z}e1 29.\Delta f5) 29.d6 \Delta h5+30.\$\phie6.

SI 24 11

☐ Shirov
■ Benjamin

Horgen 1994 1.e4 c5 2.@f3 e6 3

1.e4 c5 2.013 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 0.c6 5.0c3 a6 6.xe2 wc7 7.xe3 0.f6 8.0-0 xe7 9.f4 d6 10.we1 0-0 11.wg3 0xd4 12.xxd4 b5 13.a3 xb7 14.xeh1 White can also play 14 Lac1 at once. See the

previous game Balinov-Kragelj. 14...皇c6 15.里ae1 響b7 16.皇d3 b4 17.公d1

17.axb4 響xb4 18.至e2 has been played here as well, e.g. 18. 響b7 19.e5 全b5 20.響h3 g6 21.至g3 dxe5 22.毫xe5 全xg3+ 23.bxg3 &b5!?, with approximately equal play, Shirov-Ivanchuk, Linares 1993.

17...g6?!

This is probably not a good idea. A better option seems to be 17...bxa3 Backs Gr18...d51?19.e5 ⊕e4, suggested by Nikitin and Kasparov) 19.⊕12 ⊕15 20.₩13 gad roughly equal prospects, Shirov-Movsesian, Saraisva 2004.

18.⊕f2 bxa3 19.bxa3 ⊕h5

Having played g6, Black can not really afford to go 19...d5: 20.e5 ⊕e4 21.£xe4 dxe4 22.⊕g4 If d8 23.⊕h6+, with an attack, Sznapik-Smeikal. Sandomierz 1976.

20.₩e3 @xf4?!

This books good, but there is a hitch. However, 20...15 won't do either in view of 2.1. \pm cd! d5 22. \pm cd5! ext5! (22...dxc4 is met by 23. \pm c6+ \pm d7 24.fxg6 hxg6 25. \pm fxg6+ \pm g6 26. \pm g4!, winning) 23. \pm f3 \pm f6 24. \pm d3, with advantage for White, Shirov.

The Pole Ksieski has suggested 20... Ife8 21. If a f8, but then 22.f5, with the point of 22...exf5? 23.\(\mathbb{Z}\)xf5!, looks strong.
21.\(\mathbb{Z}\)xf4 e5



22.@q4! f6?!

Black keeps the fork in place for a while longer, but the text has serious drawbacks. 22...ex447 runs into 23.9h6, mate, of course, but 22...ex44 was worth trying, even though White is better after 23.9h6. \$\psi_2\$7 24.9x17 \$\psi_2\$5 25.\$\psi_x\$5 \$\psi_x\$7 26.651. Thus Shirov.

23.≗c4+ ⊈h8

23... 全g7 runs into the devastating 24. 管h6+ 空h8 25. 宣f3!, e.g. 25... 全xe4 26. 显xe4! 管xe4 27. 富h3 g5 28. 全d3.

24. 0 xe5! dxe5 25. @xe5 ca7

After 25...fxe5 White plays 26.\(\text{\pi}\xext{26}\) \(\perp \) (or 26...\(\pi\)(f) 27.\(\pi\x\)(f) \(\pi\)(g7 \quad 28.\(\pi\x\)(f) \(\pi\)(g7 \quad 28.\(\pi\x\)(f) \(\pi\)(g7 \quad 28.\(\pi\)(f) \(\pi\)(f) \(\pi\)(g7 \quad 40.\(\pi\)(g7 \quad 40.\(\pi\)(g7 \quad 40.\(\pi\)(g7 \quad 40.\(\pi\)(g7 \quad 40.\(\pi\)) \(\pi\)(g7 \quad 40.\(\pi\)(g7 \quad 40.\(\pi\)(g7 \quad 40.\(\pi\)) \(\pi\)(g7 \quad 40.\(\pi\)(g7 \quad 40.\(\pi\)) \(\pi\)(g7 \quad 40.\(\pi\)) \(\pi\)(g7 \quad 40.\(\pi\)(g7 \quad 40.\(\pi\)) \(\pi\)(g7 \quad 40.\(\pi\)) \(\pi\)(g7

Black is still alive, but he is a pawn down and his position is riddled with holes. White finishes the job quickly.

27.c3 h6 28.Ib1 Wa8 29.Ib6! Ixd4 Desperation! No better was 29... Ixd4 30.Ic1 Ixg2+ 31.Ixg1 Ide8 32.Ixe7+ Ixe7 33.Ixf6, and Black might as well resign. 30.cxd4 Ixe4 31.Ic1 f5

31...皇xg2+ is no good either now: 32.专g1 皇d8 33.重b8 警f3 34.重xd8! 管xf4 35.重e7+, and mate.

32.₩e5+ @f6 33.¤xf6

Black resigned. After 33...\mathbb{\mathbb{Z}}xf6 White decides the issue with 34.\mathbb{\mathbb{W}}e7+.

97

Sozin and Velimirovic Variations

Black plays 2... 2c6 and 5...d6, White plays 6.2c4

SI 26.2

☐ Madl ■ Chiburdanidze

Ratumi 2000 1.e4 c5 2.9f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4

@f6 5.@c3 @c6 6.@c4 e6 7.@e3 a6 8. gb3 當c7 9.f4 ge7 10. 當f3 A good alternative is 10.0-0; 10...0-0 11.\dot\f3

@xd4 12.@xd4 b5 13.e5 gives rise to interesting positions. The books will tell you more, 10. @xd4 11. @xd4 b5 12.e5

Sharp play! Good for Black is 12.0-0-0 &b7,

but 12.f5 is also an option.

12...dxe5 13.fxe5

13. Wxa8?! is very risky; after 13...exd4 14 9e20-015.響f3 gb7 16.響h3 gb4+17.c3 dxe3 18.bxe3 ac5 Black has good play for the exchange.

13... gb7 14. gq3 @e4!?

This was a new move in the days this game was played. The books of the time gave 14... 心h5 15. 實 g4 g6 16.0-0-0 0-0-0, with the assessment "unclear", but 15.實f2!? may be stronger

15.\\xq7?

This looks very dubious, and the refutation duly follows. Simply 15. 2xe4 2xe4 16.0-0 0-0 resulted in an equal position.

15.. 0-0-0 16.IIf1

16.0-0-0 is met by 16... adg8, and after both 17. wxf7 and 17. wh6 White loses her queen with 17... 2g5+. No better is 16. 2xe4 2xe4 17. Ef1 (17.0-0-0? Edg8 loses the queen again) 17... 2g6, and White is in serious trou-

16...單hg8 17.要xf7

17. wxh7 is met by 17... 2g5 18. wd3 &c5 22. wxd4 ②f3+! 23.gxf3 wxd4 24. 公xd4 Ig 1+, and Black has a winning endgame. 17... Exa2 18. wxe6+

18.@xe4 is no better; after 18... axd4 19 wxe6+ (or 19.公d6+ sb8), 19...sb8 Black wins.

18 .. \$\dip b8 19.0-0-0 \(\tilde{a}\$ a5+ 20.\$\dip b1 \(\tilde{a}\$ d2+ 21 Txd2 Txd2 22. 9 b6

This is probably what White had intended. But Black throws a serious spanner in the works!



22 Wxc3! 23. 9 xd8

23.bxc3 runs into 23... Ed1+ 24. Exd1 Exd1+ 25. \$\pmub2 \overline{ac1+}, and mate on the next move. 23...\#f3!

The point of the move 22... #xc3! The queen is untouchable in view of mate on d1, which is very much on the cards anyway.

24. ac7+ wxc7 25. wf7+ wxf7 26. xf7+

White resigned.

SI 26.6

☐ Ankerst ■ Panchenko

Bled 1992

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 9c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 € f6 5. € c3 d6 6. € c4 e6 7. € e3 . € e7 8.f4

Also interesting is 8...d5!?, which is followed by 9.exd5 exd5 10.2b5 2d7 11. #f3, with an unclear position.

9.₩f3 @xd4

After 9... 2a5 White simply goes 10. 2d3.

10. 9 xd4 e5

Another reasonable idea is 10 Wa5 11 0-0 and only then 11...e5.

11. e3

11.fxe5 dxe5 12.@xe5 is met by 12...@g4 13. af4 實d4.14. ad3. ab4! 15. ad2. ac5. and Black has compensation for the pawn, according to Panchenko.

11 eyf4 12 @ yf4

After 12. #xf4, 12... 2g4 looks like a good

12... wa5 13. ab3 ag4 14. wd3?! Better was 14. Wg3 when, according to Pan-

chenko, 14... 2d7 is Black's strongest reply. 14 d5!

Another pawn sacrifice!

15.exd5

15.e5 is followed by 15...d4! 16.實xd4 公d7 17 #d5 &c5 with compensation, while after 15 @xd5 @xd5 16 @xd5 @b6 17 @b3 @d4 Black also has good play for the pawn.

15 @c5 16 h32!

White should have played 16. \$\psi d2! at once.

although Black has good prospects after 16... Efd8 17. Eac1 &b4, again according to Panchenko

16... #fe8+ 17. \$d2?

Now this move is nicely refuted. Correct was 17. \$\psi f1, with good prospects for Black after 17....皇h5 (or 17....皇d7!?) 18.g4 皇g6 19.響b5 ₩xb5+ 20.@xb5 @e4, Panchenko.



17.... e e2! 18.單f5 has to be lost

After 18 Wxe2 Txe2+ 19 dxe2 @b4 White

18... e4+ 19.中c1 要xc3! 20.要xe4 Or 20.bxc3 &a3+ 21.\$b1 @xc3 mate! 20... Txe4

White resigned.

SI 26.6

☐ De Firmian ■ Grischuk

Esbiera 2000

1 e4 c5 2 0 f3 0 c6 3 0 c3 d6 4 d4 cxd4 5.0xd4 @f6 6.@c4 e6 7.@e3 @e7 8.f4 0-0 9.\#f3 e5!?

Black can also play 9...a6 or 9... #a5, or even 9 @xd4 10 @xd4 e5 - as in Ankerst-Panchenko

10 @xc6 bxc6 11 f5

After 11.fxe5 dxe5 12.h3 Black can choose

between 12 @e6 and 12 @e8, in both cases with approximately equal play.

11... wa5 12.0-0-0 ab7

An alternative is 12... \$\mu\$b8!?, e.g. 13.\$\mu\$b3 (according to Golubey White should play 13 @d217 now to prevent the coming exchange sacrifice) 13... Exb3! 14.cxb3 d5 15.exd5 cxd5 16.\(\mathbb{I}\)xd5 \(\alpha\)xd5 \(\mathbb{I}\)7.\(\alpha\)xd5 \(\alpha\)d6 18.耳d1 響xa2 19.公f6+ 雲h8! (19...gxf6? loses: 20. 2h6 4h8 (the only move) 21, 2xf8, Gaprindashvili-Hartoch, Amsterdam 1976, as 21... 2xf8 is met by 22. Id8) 20. Ixd6 gxf6 21.@h6?! (21.@d2 looks better) 21... IIg8 22. Id2? (this is very bad; White must not relinguish square a6) 22... #a1+ 23. \$c2 #a6 24.94 @b7. and Black had a winning attack, Borkowski-Tupek, Slupsk 1992.

13 9 h3 d5!? 14.exd5

White is as good as forced to accept the pawn sacrifice, as after 14.@d2?!, 14...@b4! 15.a3 @xc3 16.@xc3 #c7 is good for Black.

14...cxd5 15.@xd5 &xd5 16.@xd5 e4



18. û.d5!

18. \$\pi\17 runs into 18... \$\pi\x\text{2xb2+!}, and mate, while 18 a3? is met by 18... axb2!, and it is plain to see that this also wins.

18 Exh2!

The consequence of what went before; but now things are less clear.

19. cxb2 @xd5 20. cxd5?!

Now Black has perpetual check. 20. axd5? was clearly not possible in view of 20... a3+, and mate, but with Golubev's suggestion of 20 &d4! White could have tested the correctness of Black's play. The question is whether Black would have enough compensation for the sacrificed exchange after, for example 20... Ib8+ 21. eal 心b4 22. eb3 曾xf5 (22...かc6? is met by 23.響g3) 23.罩d2 響f4

20... 2a3+ 21. 2b1 Wxd5 22. Ixd5 Ib8+ 23 cba1 @b2+ 24.cb1 Draw

SI 26.7

Paylov

■ Kharitonov

Correspondence game 1986

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 d6 6.@c4 e6 7.@e3 @e7 8. We2

The notorious Velimirovic Attack. 8...0-0 9.0-0-0 a6 10.@b3 @c7 11.g4

For the second main line, 11. Hhgl, I refer to the games that can be found under the code SI 26.8 below.

11...@xd4 12.\\xd4

After 12.@xd4 Black can probably safely play 12...e5 13. @e3 @xg4.

12...40d7

Now 12...e5?! is dubious in view of 13. ac4 ₩d8 14.g5, e.g. after 14...@d7 15.\(\bar{a}\)xc8!? ₩xc8 16 @d5 @d8 17.h4, and Black's position isn't all that great.

13.a5 b5

The alternative is 13... ac5. I have to refer you to the theory books.

14.營h5 基d8 15.基g1 公c5 16.e5

In order to take the rook quickly to h4. An alternative is 16. Ig3, which could be followed by 16...g6 17. Wh6 &f8 18. Wh4 &e7!? 19.f4 h5 20.f5 Ab8, with an unclear position. Thus

Nikitin

16...q6 17.\#h3 d5

17... kb7? fails to 18. Ih4 €xb3+ 19.axb3 h5 20.以xh5! gxh5 21.實xh5, e.g. 21...皇f8 22.g6 Ixe6 23. #xe6+ @e7 24. @h6 #d7 25.exd6. and Black cannot keep a.g7 sufficiently cove-

18 #h4 @xe5 19 @d4



19...@xb3+?!

Nikitin has indicated 19...\forall f5!? as stronger: 20.營g3 (20.基xh7? won't work in view of 20 のxh3+ 21 axh3 管xh3 22 買xh3 e5 23.IIe3 exd4 24.IIxe7 dxc3) 20...@e4! 21 @ye4 dye4

The position seems to favour Black. It is doubtful whether White has compensation for the sacrificed pawn; after 22.ke5 kb7, 23. Axh7 fails to 23... 2xg5+.

20.axb3 曾f5 21.曾q3 âb7

Here 21...f6 22.gxf6 @xf6 23.\frac{1}{2}f4! @xd4 24. Axf5 exf5 25. Wh4! 总b6 26. Wf6 is good for White. After inserting 21...e5! 22. xe5 Black can safely play 22...f6: 23.gxf6 &xf6 24 9xf6 @xf6 25 Ed1 9e6 26 Ebd4 and White is better, but only marginally so, 22. \$\phi b1!

22. Exh7? is impossible again in view of 22 @xo5+

22... 0 d6 23.f4 h5

Now the threat of capturing on h7 became reality!

24.gxh6 e.p. \$h7 25.6 d1!

White has the position completely under control. Black is probably already lost.

25 Tac8 26 ⊘e3 ₩e4



27.₩q5! Well played!

27... w xd4 28.f5 we5

28... wxh4 loses at once in view of 29.fxg6+. while 28... \widetilde{\pi} xe3 29. \widetilde{\pi} xe3 exf5 is honeless as well: 30.曾d4.全f8.31.曾f6.耳d7.32.耳e1. and White should win

29.fxq6+ &h8

Or 29...fxg6 30. 實xg6+ 由h8 31.h7, and mate. 30.q7+ \$h7 31.q8 #+! \$\mu\$xq8 32. #\ma\$q7+! Ĭxg7 33.hxg7+ ŵg8 34.Ĭh8 Mate.

SI 26 8

☐ Bosch ■ Gross

Schönack 1996

1 e4 c5 2 0f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 0 xd4 @f6 5.@c3 @c6 6.@c4 e6 7.@e3 a6 8. We2 Wc7 9. 2b3 2e7 10.0-0-0 0-0 11.Xhq1 @xd4?!

11...b5 and 11...43d7 are stronger continuati-

12.@xd4 b5 13.q4 @d7 14.q5 b4

There is nothing for it except to bite the bullet - 14...g6 15.f4 b4 (or 15...@c5 16.f5) 16.@a4 is good for White, Bosch

15. wh5! bxc3

15... Ie8 is met by 16.g6!, and wins. For 15... De5, see the game Boto-Buntic.



16. Ad3!

16.g6? at once is too hasty: 16...fxg6 17. 2xe6+ 2h8 18. 2xg6 2e5 19. 2dg1 2f6. and White resigned, Link-Cebalo, Cannes 1993.

16...\#d8

Other moves are no better: 16... 2b7 17. 2h3 @xe4 18.g6!, or 16... Ze8 17.g6! hxg6 18. Exg6, or 16... 學b7 17. Eg4! Ee8 18. Ef3 g6 19. wxh7+!. and White wins in all cases.

17.g6! hxg6 18.\(\mathbb{I}\)xg6 \(\infty\)e5

Or 18... & f6 19 #xf6 @xf6 20. &xf6 gxf6 21 Wh6 d5 22 Th3 and it's over According to Bosch, the same goes for 18...&f8 19.Xh3.

19.\(\maxa7+! \psi xq7 \quad 20.\maxa3+ \hat{\max}q5+ 21. #xq5+ &f8 22. Ah3 cxb2+ 23. b1 **\$e8**

After 23...@g6, 24.IIh8+! wins: 24...@xh8 25. #g7+ \$e8 (25...\$e7 26. \$f6+ \$d7 27. a4+) 26. a4+ ad7 27. axh8+ ac7 28 @ f6 mate!

24.\(\mathbb{I}\)h8+ \(\phi\)d7 25.\(\pa\)a4+ \(\Omega\)c6 26.\(\mathbb{I}\)xd8+

And Black resigned in view of 26... #xd8 27 @xc6+ @c7 28 @xd8+ or 28.@b6+.

SI 26 8

Boto

■ Buntic

Bosnia-Hercegovina 2001

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5 @c3 @c6 6 @c4 e6 7.@e3 @e7 8 me2 0-0 9 0-0-0 mc7 10 0h3 a6 11.\(\mathbb{I}\)ha1 \(\alpha\)d7 12.a4 \(\alpha\)xd4 13.\(\alpha\)xd4 b5 14.q5 b4 15.\diphi h5 @e5

Up to this point, everything is as in the game Bosch-Gross. Now Black tries a change of tack. 16.f4 @a6

16...公c6 is met by 17.急f6! bxc3 18.響h6, and wins. Maybe Black could have played 16...bxc3. 17.f5! 4 f4

After 17...exf5 White plays 18. 2d5 ₩d8 19 @f6+ and wins while after 17, bxc3 he would continue 18. #df1! cxb2+ 19. \$b1, e.g. 19...exf5 20.exf5 @e5 21.@xe5 dxe5 22.g6, winning, or 19... Ee8 20. Ef3 Ad8 21. Eh3 のf8 22.9xg7! 空xg7 23.費h6+ 空h8 24.f6. and mate.

18.\frac{\pi}{18} f3 e5 19.q6! bxc3

After 19...exd4 20. wxf4 bxc3 White has the beautiful win 21. 實h6! gxh6 22.gxf7++ 由h8 23. \$\mathbb{I}g8+. while 19...hxg6 is met by 20.實xf4! as in the game, e.g. 20...exf4 21. 基xg6 基d8 22. 基xg7+ 由f8 23. 包d5 響a5 24. Adg1 de8 25. Ab6.



20. wxf4!

Very nice! The weakness of g7 will be Black's undoing.

20...¢h8

20...exf4 is met by 21.gxf7+ Exf7 22.Exg7+ 以18 23.耳xf7+ 如e8 24.f6 関a5 25.耳xe7+ 4d8 26. Igl, and it's curtains! And after 20.... 2f6 White wins with 21. 響h6!.

21 axf7! @f6

Or 21...exf4 22.@xg7 mate: or 21...exd4 22.f6! @xf6 23.@xf6!: or 21... [xf7 22.@xf7 #16 23. #d5! with winning play e.g. 23...exf4 24.@xf6 cxb2+25.@xb2 IIb8 26 f6 Variations by the proud white player.

22. Exq7! ≜xq7

Or 22 &e6 23 &ve6 exf4 24 &vf6 b6 25. Adg1, and it's over.

23.f6 \d8

Or 23...exf4 24.fxg7 mate; or 23... Xxf7 24.fxg7+ \$\psixg7 25.\pmg1+ \$\pmf8 26.\pmh6+ \$\pme7\$ 27.@xf7 exd4 28.Eg7 \$\d8 29.\d5. 24.¤a1

Black resigned.

SI 26 8

☐ Gallo Masetti

Correspondence game 1986

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 f6 5.0 c3 @c6 6.0 c4 e6 7 0 e3 0 e7 8. we2 0-0 9.0-0-0 a6 10. ab3 wc7 11.g4 @d7 12.\(\mathbb{I}\)hg1 @c5 13.g5

For the standard sacrifice 13.4\f5!? see the game Ginsburg-Lanka

13...b5

Black can also clear square c8 more quickly with 13 全d7 14 變h5 單fe8

14. 0xc6 0xb3+ 15.axb3 @xc6 16. @h5 h4 17 @d4! @h7

After 17...bxc3? White has the deadly 18. Wh6! - the queen is invulnerable and 18...e5 is simply met by 19.2xe5, Balion-

Boersma, Groningen 1974. Better is 17... 2d7!? 18. Ig4 bxc3 19. Ih4 2xg5+ 20. mxg5 cxb2+ 21. axb2 e5 22. 其g1 g6 23. Wh6 Ifc8, and Black stayed alive in Roth-Stanec, Austria 1994.

18.4 d5!



18. #g4 won't work in view of 18...bxc3 19 耳h4 cxb2+ 20.@xb2 響xe4 and h7 is covered!

18...exd5 19.Ed3

19 Wh6 is now refuted with 19... Wxc2+! 20.\$xc2罩fc8+21.\$b1 gxh622.gxh6+\$f8.

19... Ifc8 20.c3 bxc3 21.bxc3 In Golubey-Shapiro, Odessa 1983, White

played 21 Th3: after 21 cxb2++ 22 cbxb2 由f8 (after 22... 對c2+?! 23. 由a3 對xe4? White now has 24.g6!, winning) 23.IIf3 \$268 24. #xf7+ &d8 an unclear position arose. 21.耳f3!? cxb2++ 22.\$xb2 響c2+ 23.\$a3 直f8 24. 直h3 響xe4 25.g6 fxg6 26. 響xh7+ 虫f7 27.@xg7 g5 28.@xf8+ Wxh7 29.Exh7+ \$xf8 is also unclear.

21...dxe4 22. Ih3 &f8 23.a6 fxa6? Now White wins by force, Correct is 23...h6!

24. £xg7+ (or 24.gxf7 £f6 25. £xf6 gxf6 26. wxh6+ 如e7) 24...如e8 25.gxf7+ 如d7, and it is very unclear whether White has compensation for the piece he is down.

24. \alpha xa6! hxa6 25. \alpha xa6

Black resigned. A rather curious end to a correspondence game!

SI 26.8

☐ Ginsburg
■ Lanka

Cappelle la Grande 1997

1.e4 c5 2.全f3 全c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.全xd4 全f6 5.全c3 d6 6.요c4 e6 7.息e3 息e7 8.豐e2 a6 9.0-0-0 豐c7 10.息b3 0-0 11.其hq1 全d7 12.q4 全c5

A standard position in the Velimirovic Attack. Black will be bombarded with sacrifices! 13.6/15!? b5

Taking the knight is extremely risky: 13...exf5?! 14.gxf5, e.g. 14...&d7 15.⊕d5 ₩ 68 16.₩f5 ⊈h8 17.ℤxg7! ⊈xg7 18.f6+1, and White wins, S. Sokolov-K. Grigorian, Soviet Union 1978.

14.ûd5!?



This bishop sacrifice is another standard turn in the Sozin.

14.... b7

Taking the bishop looks suspect and has hardly ever been played. After 14..exd5 15.€xd5 ₩57 16.e5 €e6 17.€xdx7+ (or 17.exd6 £d8 18.f4) 17...€xe7 18.€xd6, followed by 19.f4, White will at any rate have compensation for the sacrificed piece.

15.g5 ⊈fc8

Black still cannot really take the f5 knight: 15...exf5?! 16.g6!, e.g. 16...hxg6 17.\(\pi\xg6\) ©e5 18. Ixg7+! ⊈xg7 19. Ig1+ ©g6 20.exf5, and White had a winning attack, A.Sokolov-Salov, Nikolaev 1983.

16.₩h5

The alternative is $16.\mathbb{E}[3]$, after which the main line, according to the books, is 16.... $\mathfrak{g}[8]$ $17.\mathbb{E}[5]$ $17.\mathbb{E}[5]$ $17.\mathbb{E}[5]$ $18.\mathbb{E}[5]$ $18.\mathbb{E}[5]$ $18.\mathbb{E}[5]$ $19.\mathbb{E}[5]$ $19.\mathbb{E}[5]$ 1

16...⊕e5

16...b4 may be followed by 17.\(\hat{\omega}\)xe6! \(\Delta\)xe6 (17...\(\frac{1}{2}\)xe6 fails to 18.g6! h6 19.\(\hat{\omega}\)xh6) 18.\(\Delta\)d5.
17.f4 \(\Delta\)g6 18.\(\mag\)g3! b4

After 18...exd5 White plays 19.**±**h3 △f8 20.**±**d4, as in the game, e.g. 20....○cc6 21.**±**xg71, and now 21...**±**xg7 fails to 22.**±**h6+6 23.**±**xf7 △g6 24.**±**g8+ **±**xg8 25.**±**17+, while 21..**±**d8 is met by 22.**±**h6, and wins.

19. Ih3 @f8

After 19...h6 20.gxh6 gxh6 21.\(\mathbb{w}\)xh6 \(\alpha\)fo 22.\(\alpha\)d4 \(\mathbb{w}\)d8 23.\(\mathbb{z}\)g1 \(\alpha\)xd4 24.e5! Black is also finished, while running away with 19...\(\alpha\)r8 won't help either: 20.\(\mathbb{w}\)xh7 \(\alpha\)e8 21.\(\alpha\)xc5 dxc5 22.\(\alpha\)xe6.

20. kd4! exd5

Or 20...bxc3 21.鬱h6! 公b3+ (21...gxh6 22.公xh6 mate) 22.始b1 总f6 23.总xf6, and Black is mated anyway.

21.@xg7!



21....âd8

Or 21...bxc3 22.@h6+ @xg7 23.\%xf7+, and mate.

22.âd4 f6 23.gxf6 @g6 24.f7+!

Black resigned in view of 24... \$\pm\$xf7 25. \$\pm\$xh7+ \$\pm\$e8 26. \$\pm\$xg6+ \$\pm\$d7 27. \$\pm\$h7+.

SI 26.8

☐ Hoffer
■ Johnson

Correspondence game 1989

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 0.c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 0.f6 5.0c3 d6 6.xc4 e6 7.xe3 xe7 8.we2 a6 9.0-0 wc7 10.xb3 0-0 11.xhg1 b5 12.g4 0.a5 13.g5 0.xb3+ 14.axb3 0.d7 15.f4

Another idea is 15. II g3, to start an attack with Wh5 and II g3-h3.

15...⊕c5

After 15...b4 White also continues 16.£151?. After 16...exf5?! 17.£05 ÿd8 18.exf5 he has compensation for the sacrificed piece, e.g. 18...£8 19.£d4 £78 20.ÿh5, with a strong attack, Wolff-LSokolov, Junior world championship, Baguio 1987.



16.@f5!? @xb3+?!

Black should have thought better of this intermediate move. Stronger is 16...exf5!? 17.①d5 響b7(17...實d8? won't work in view of

Weak is 17.cxb3? exf5, and now White can-

not play ⊕d5. 17...exf5 18.⊕d5 ₩b7 19.e5! dxe5

20.@f6+! gxf6

Or 22... **E**e8 23. **a**d4!. 23. **a**q2 **f**6 24. **a**xa8 **a**b7 25. **a**d7!

An important point. Now the job is definitely

25... 2xa8 26. 1xe7 2e4 27.fxe5 fxe5 28. 1xe5

Black resigned.

☐ Pereira, Alvaro
■ Varabiescu

Correspondence game 1981

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 ⊕f6 5.⊕c3 d6 6.≗e3 ⊕c6 7.≜c4 ≜e7 8.數e2 0-0 9.0-0-0 a6 10.並b3 數c7 11.g4 ②d7 12.g5 ②c5 13.黨hg1 b5 14.數h5 g6 15.數h6 互e8 16.黨g3 並f8 17.數h4 b4

17... £e7!? is also possible, when Black meets 18 \$\mu\$h 3 with 18... h5.

18.@xc6!

Less accurate is 18. IIIh3?; after 18...Ih5 19.gxh6 e.p. bxc3 20. 4xc6 4xb3+ 21.axb3 Black has 21...e5!, which refutes everything.

19...bxc3? is met by 20.âd4 e5 (20...₩xc6 21.₩xh7+, and mate follows!) 21.£b4, and now 21...cxd4 doesn't work in view of 22.£d5.

20. 9 d4 h5

White was threatening 21.₩xh7+, and mate, while 20...e5 would have run into 21. ad5, of

course. 21.gxh6 e.p. e5 22.@d5 exd4 23.\(\bar{\textbf{\pi}}\)dg1



23... Xa7?

This loses. Also bad is 23... &6? 24 \pm 8 \pm 96+ \pm 106 25. \pm 8 \pm 96+ 26. \pm 95. and mate, or 23... \pm 95? 24. \pm 95! (but not 24. \pm 86+? \pm 86 25. \pm 86+ \pm 97- 26. \pm 95 \pm 91+, e.g. 24... \pm 96 25. \pm 96+ \pm 98 26.0 \pm 98. or 24... \pm 96 25.0 \pm 96 or 26.0 \pm 98. or 27... \pm 96 25.0 \pm 96 or 26.0 \pm 97. or 27.0 \pm 98 10 \pm 91. or 27.0 \pm 98 10 \pm 9

And not 28. ■g7? ₩xe4!.

After the text Black resigned.

SI 26.9

□ Nunn

■ Estremera

Leon 1997

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 0f6 5.0c3 0c6 6.ac4 e6 7.ae3 a6 8.we2 wc7 9.0-0-0 ae7 10.ab3 0a5 11.g4 b5 12.g5 0xb3+ 13.axb3 0d7



14.h4

An important alternative is 14-2:672. After 14...exf5 15...25...5 Black should not play 16...0-07, as in the game Velimirovice Softweski, Vigoslav championship 1965: 17.66 gxf6 18...2641 Ce5 19...256 Δxf6 23...267 - 24.72 24...256 34...265 22...28 x 56 23...267 - 457 24...256 34...261 Black resigned, but 16...257 - ...26 17.6 gxf6 18...261 25...256 19...263 Eg8, with a highly unclear position.

14...0-0?! is met strongly by 15.g6!, e.g. 15...hxg6 16.h5, or 15...\(\Delta \)c5 16.gxh7+ \(\Phi \)h8

17. Ingl. But 14... ⊕c5 and 14... ♠b7 are playable options – I will have to refer you to the books

15. 2a4 2c5 16.h5 &d7

After 16... ♠b7?! White plays 17.g6!, but 16... ♠x64? is a possibility, e.g. 17.g6 ♠f6 l8.gxf7+ ♠xf7, with unclear play, Emms-Hennigan, Dundee 1993.

17. cbh1

Now 17.g6 was a possibility again; it is followed by 17... £xb3+! 18. £xb3 £xa4 19.h6!? fxg6 20.hxg7 £g8, with complicated play. 17... £xa4

After 18... €xa4 White is confronted with another choice: 19.g6!? or 19.f4!? – it's all very difficult!

19.f3

Again: 19.g6!? or 19.f4!? was worth considering.

22.q6!



The thematic move; but it won't yield more than a draw. Other continuations are probably no better: 22. Ih2 0-0 23.g6 @c5 24.h6 fxg6

25.hxg7 IIf7 26.IIdh1 IIxg7, Wedberg-Van der Wiel, Haninge 1989, or 22. IId2 0-0 23.g6 ⊕c5 24.h6 fxg6 25.hxg7 IIf7, Onischuk-Van der Wiel, Wijk aan Zee 1996, with reasonable play for Black in both cases.

22 05

Less good is 22...fxg6?! 23.届h2! e5 24.皇e6 營c6 25.營xc6 萬xc6 26.hxg6 兔f6 27.届xh7, with advantage for White, Hector-Rytshagov, Göteborg 1997. If 22...兔f6, then 23.營a4 is a good reply.

23.gxf7+ \$xf7 24.₩d5+ \$e8 25.\$e6

White has to abandon c2, and now Black has perpetual check.

SI 26.11

☐ Fischer

■ Delv

Skopie 1967

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 ⊕f6 5.⊕c3 ⊕c6 6.≜c4 e6 7.≜b3 a6 8.f4

≝a5A good alternative is 8... \(\hat{\omega}\)e7; after 9.\(\hat{\omega}\)e3 0-0
10.\(\hat{\omega}\)f3 the position from Polgar-Ivanov and

Ehlvest-Mednis, SI 26.12, has arisen. 9.0-0 ♠xd4?!

After 9...d5 Fischer would have played 10.€xx6 bxx6 11.15, when he observes that 11...&x5+ 12.*kh1 0-0 would have yielded Black a defensible position. Instead of 10.€xx6, White can also play 10..&a4!?, a suggestion from Golubex.

10.₩xd4 d5

The queen swap with 10... \$\mathbb{w}\$c5 is obvious enough, but then \$11. \$\mathbb{w}\$xc5 dxc5 12.a4! is very good for White, positionally speaking. 11.\(\text{a}\mathbb{e}3!\) \$\infty\$xe4

Or 11...dxe4 12.@xe4 @xe4 (12...@e7 13.@d6+)13.@a4+!.11...@g4 is not satisfac-

tory either, as this is met by 12. \$\phi\n!\$ £xe3 13.\pi\neq xe4 14.\pi\neq xe4 \(\left(xe7 \) 15.\pi\neq ae1, with good play for White; 15...0-0 is strongly met by 16.f5.

12. 2xe4 dxe4 13.f5! \begin{array}{c} b4?

After 13...exf5, 14.g4! would have been very unpleasant, but now the game is forced to a finish

14 fye6 @ ye6 15 @ ye6 fye6



SI 26.12

☐ Balion

■ Jhunjhnuwala

Teesside 1974

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 0c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 0f6 5.0c3 d6 6.0c4 e6 7.0b3 0e7

This exchange is not bad, but it is not without risk either.

10. ±x44 b5 11.0-0 0-0 12.g4 ₩c7?!
This is a rather pointless move, after which the white attack quickly gains in strength.
Better is 12... ±b7 13.a3 ₩c7 14.g5 Φd7 15. Llng1 Φc5 16.æ2 Ead8 17.₩f5 €xe4 8.g6. Judit Polear-Domineuez. Novi Sad

Olympiad 1990, and now Black should simply have played 18...fxg6!. After 19...xc6+

\$\delta\$h8 20.\tilde{x}xg6 \(\frac{\pi}{2}\)ft. ftings are by no means
clear, 12...\tilde{x}4!713.\(\frac{\pi}{2}\)saf \(\frac{\pi}{2}\)b7 is also good, as it
forces White to play 14.f3, after which chances are roughly equal.

13.g5 @d7 14.wh5 @c5 15.lhg1

16.axb3 b4

In a recent game, 16...g6 turned out to be no better: 17.₩h6 f6 18.gxf6 ±xf6 19.±xf6 ±xf6 20.e51 dxe5 21.∞e4 ±18 22.±xg6+ hxg6 23.±g1 ₩g7 24.±xg6 ±17 25.€xf6+, and Black resigned, Todorovic-Jakab, Budapest 2001. 1.7 ⊕f61 hxg.

17... 五d8 prevents the now decisive move, but then White plays 18. 五g3 bxc3 19. 五h3 堂/k3 (or 19...h6 20. 竇/kh6! gxh6 21. 五xh6 全xf6 22. gxf6, with inevitable mate) 20. 金xg7+! 全x68 (20... 全xg7 is mate in two) 21. 五73, e.g.

21...cxb2+ 22.空b1 息b7 23.響xf7+ 空d7 24.置fd3, and Black has enormous problems.



18. ₩h6!

An aesthetic final move! Mate is inevitable. Black resigned. SI 26 12

☐ Bangiev ■ Shakarov

Grozny 1974

1.e4 c5 2. Ω 13 Ω c6 3.d4 cxd4 4. Ω xd4 Ω 16 5. Ω c3 d6 6. Ω c4 e6 7. Ω e3 Ω e7 8.0-0 0-0 9. Ω b3 a6 10.f4 Ω xd4 11. Ω xd4 b5 12.e5!?

18. 實f!!? or 18.a4!? is also possible, according to Bangiev.

18... ♠c5
An idea from Golubev is 18... ♠d5!? – now Black is no longer bothered by the weakness of the e6 square.

19.\(\bar{\pm}\)d1

After 19.h4 Black plays 19...\(\mathbb{g}\)3 (but 19...\(\mathbb{g}\)xh4? is not good in view of 20.\(\mathbb{g}\)xc5 21.\(\mathbb{g}\)xc6; after 20.\(\mathbb{g}\)xc5 \(\mathbb{g}\)xc5 21.\(\mathbb{g}\)xc6 in stead of the text, 19.\(\mathbb{g}\)after 13 is also possible, according to Golubev.

19...\(\frac{1}{2}\)fd8 20.h4!? \(\psi\) a6!

After 20...豐xh4? White plays 21.互xf?! \$\pi\text{7}\$ 22.\text{2}\text{xc5}\$, and wins: 22...豐e4 (or 22...\text{2}\text{2}\$ 23.\text{2}\text{xc5}\$, or 22...\text{2}\text{2}\$ 23.\text{2}\text{6}\text{4}\text{7}\$ 24.\text{2}\text{4}\$ bef 47 24.\text{2}\text{4}\$ 23.\text{2}\text{2}\text{4}\$ beg8 (23...\text{4}\text{2}\text{6}\text{2}\text{4}\text{2}\text{4}\$ bef 7 25.\text{2}\text{2}\$ 12.\text{2}\text{4}\$ L. Thus Bangiev. Note that with the rook on d1, 20...署g3? is not good: 21.皇xc5 互xc5 22.皇xe6.

21.@xc5

21.d7 yields nothing: 21... ⊕xd7 22. 耳df1 耳f8 23.h5 響e4 24. 響d2 響g4 25. ♠xg7 響xg7 26. 響xd7 ♣d5 27. ♠xd5 耳cd8 28. 響a7 耳xd5, with equal play.

21.h5 is met by 21...營g5 or 21...營e4. 21...萬xc5



22. Idf1

22.營e3 單f5 23.營b6 單d7 is good for Black, Bangiev.

22... If5 23.h5 Ixf2 24. wxf2 wxh5 25. wa7 2xq2

Black forces a draw. He could also have tried 25...\$c6, but after 26.\$c7\$c5+27.\$\bar{a}\$c6 & 28.\$\bar{a}\$xf7+ & \bar{a}\$h8 29.\$\bar{a}\$xe6 it's about equal. 26.\$\bar{a}\$xg2\$\bar{a}\$g5+

And a draw. Black has perpetual check.

SI 26.12

☐ Ehlvest ■ Mednis

Las Vegas 1998

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 ⊕c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 ⊕f6 5.⊕c3 d6 6.皇c4 e6 7.皇e3 皇e7 8.皇b3 0-0 9.f4 a6 10.∰f3 ⊕xd4

For 10... £d7, see the game Polgar-Ivanov, 11 @ vd4 h5 12 @ vf6

12.e5?! at once is less good: 12...dxe5. and now 13.豐xa8?! exd4 14.0e4 豐a5+ 15.0d2 響c7 16.響f3 兔b7, with good play for the exchange. Also possible is 13,fxe5?! \wxd4 14 exf6 @c5! when 15 @xa8? won't work in view of 15... #f2+ 16. #d1 &e3. so that White has to play 13. xe5, with a good position for Black after 13... \$\mathbb{\pi}\$a7.

12... xf6! 13.e5 Will he win a piece now? 13...ûh4+ 14.a3 ≣b8 The answer is not



15.0-0-0

The 12th match game Short-Kasnarov, London 1993, saw 15.gxh4 &b7 16.2e4 dxe5 17. Ig1 g6 18. Id1 全xe4 19. 響xe4 響xh4+, and Black's many nawns provided sufficient compensation for the bishop.

15... 9 b7

15... êe7 is also possible; after 16.exd6 êxd6 17 @e4 @h7 Black is not had

16. Qe4 @xe4 17. @xe4 d5 18. @f3

18. #d3 had been played before. In Morozevich-Mitenkov Moscow 1991 Black was worse after 18 @e7 19 h4 @a5 (after 19 a5 an important point of 18. #d3 is revealed: 20.c3 b4 21.&c2 g6 22.h5 bxc3 23.hxg6 hxg6 24. and wins) 20.f5 b4 21. 實f3 含h8 22.f6 gxf6 23.exf6 @d6 24.g4 IIg8?! 25.g5

響c5 26. [ang 1 . a.c7 27. [ag2. But 24... 響b5! is an improvement: 25.g5 a5, and now, for instance, 26.g6 fxg6 27.f7 dg7 28. 4hf1 de5 29. IIde 1 IIb7 and Black seems able to hold. 18... 9 e7 19.f5 a5 20.c3 a4 21. 9 c2 b4!

Black's reaction forces White to save himself with perpetual check, as 22. @xa4? bxc3 cannot be good.

22...gxf6 23. @xh7+!

23.exf6? @xf6 24.@h5 @g5+ 25.@b1 f5 or 23.彎h5? f5 24.g4 兔g5+ 25,\$b1 bxc3 are both insuffient, so White forces a draw, 23... axh7 24. ah5+ aq7 25. aq4+ Draw.

SI 26 12

Polgar, Judit

■ Ivanov, Igor New York 1989

1.e4 c5 2.913 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 Øf6 5.Øc3 Øc6 6. Øc4 e6 7. Øb3 Øe7 8. 0e3 0-0 9.f4 a6 10. @f3 0d7

Other moves here are 10... \$\mathbb{e}^{\capprox} 07. 10... \$\omega a5\$ and 10...@xd4 11.@xd4 b5: for the latter option, see the previous game Ehlvest-Mednis. 11.0-0-0 Ac8!? 12.f5?!

This reveals an important point of 10... 2d7 and 11... Ec8. 12.g4 has been recommended as an improvement, but the question remains whether White will have sufficient compensation for the exchange after the continuation 12...@xd4 13.@xd4 e5 14.fxe5 @xg4 15.實g2 dxe5 16. axe5 axd1 17. axd1 實e8 @xc6, and only now 13.f5.

12... xd4 13. xd4 e5 14. e3 Exc3!

A thematic sacrifice in the Sicilian, Less strong is 14...b5 15.g4 b4 16.@d5 @xd5 17. axd5 曾c7 18. ad2 ac6 19.g5 axd5 20.exd5, with unclear play.

15.bxc3 @c6.16.@b2

After 16.2d5 2xd5 17.exd5 @a5 18.4b2

Ec8 Black also has very good prospects. 16... 2xe4 17. ₩q4 d5 18. Ed3 ₩a5



The outcome of the exchange sacrifice is clear: Black is holding all the trumps. He is already threatening 19 @xc3 20 Exc3 @a3+

19.≙h6 ≜f6 20.≅q3

A desperate move, probably played in the knowledge that other moves wouldn't help either, After, for example, 20. #f3 Black plays 20. Sh8 or 20. d4!?.

20...@xq3 21.@xq7 @xq7 22.f6 @h5 23.Xf1 @xf6

White resigned.

SI 26 12

□ Troinov ■ Popov

Cheliabinsk 1962

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 € 16 5.€ c3 € c6 6. ac4 e6 7.0-0 ae7 8. e3 0-0 9. b3 a6 10.f4 d5?!

This move gives White too many chances on the kingside, But after 10... 公a5, 11. 實f3 實c7 12.g4 offers White good prospects. 10...\$\xd4 11.\&xd4 b5 is probably Black's best continuation. This is how things went in Fischer-Spassky, second match game Reykjavik 1972, as well as in Short-Kasparov, 14th match game, London 1993.

11 e5 Ød7 12 ₩h5 ¤e8?

Intending to parry the threat #f1-f3-h3 with € f8. But White has a magnificent combination to exploit the weakening of square f7. Better is 12...g6 13. Wh6 Ze8, followed by 14... 2.f8.



13. @xd5! exd5 14. 要xf7+!

The amazing point of the first sacrifice. White has calculated the rest down to a T. 14...\$xf7

14...\$h8 won't help in view of 15.@e6. 15.@xd5+ @a6

Or 15...\$18 16.0e6+ \$17 17.0xd8++.

16.f5+ &h5 17.&f3+ &h4 18.q3+ &h3 19. g2+ gq4 20. If4+

Black resigned: after 20 \$\psib h5.21 & f3+ \psib h6 22 Th4 he is mated

SI 26 13

□ Padevsky

■ Rotvinnik

Moscow 1956

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 0c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 Øf6 5.Øc3 d6 6.@c4 e6 7.0-0 @e7 8. 9 e3 0-0 9. 9 b3 @a5 10.f4 b6

10...a6 is more common, but there is nothing wrong with the text. 11. #f3?!

This move is too slow. Better is 11.e5!?, e.g.

11...dxe5 12.fxe5 @e8. and now 13.實行.

13. ₩g4 or 13. ₩h5, with chances for both sides. I refer the reader to the theory books.

11.... ₽b7 12.04

12.f5 e5 13. ©de2 is met by 13... ©xb3 14.axb3 d5!, with good counterplay for Black.

12... ac8 13.g5
After 13. de2 Black has the strong pseudo-



13... Exc3!

Extremely strong! Black shatters White's pawn structure and captures pawn e4. He gets magnificent compensation for the exchange. This book contains several games with this theme. Another example is Polgar-Ivanov, S126.12. 14.bxc3

After 14.gxf6 草xe3 15.fxe7 (or 15.豐xe3 兔xf6) 15...草xf3 16.exd8豐 草xf1+ White remains a pawn down.

14... ②xe4 15. ₩g4 ₩c8! 16. 互f3

16.f5 is met by 16...e5! 17.♠f3 ♠xb3 18.axb3 ∰xc3 19.᠋ae1 d5 and ...♠c5. Thus Botvinnik. 16...♠xb3 17.axb3 f5 18 ₩b4

Or 18,gxf6 e.p. IIxf6! 19.15 exf5 20.0xf5 \(\hat{a}\)!8, with magnificent play for Black, e.g. 21.0.lbfInfo 22.9xc8 IIg6+ 23.8rf \(\hat{a}\):8 e3.6 4 IIxaa
\(\hat{a}\):9 42.5 IIff \(\hat{a}\):1 4-6, \(\hat{a}\):1 II 6, Botvinnik.

18...e5 19.IIh h6 20.9kf \(\bar{g}\):8 72.1 IIId ext4 22.2 dt2

Or 22.gxh6 dxe3 23.hxg7 竇xg7+, or else 22.盒xd4 竇xc2 23.gxh6 ①f6. White is lost in all variations.

22... ₩c6 23.gxh6 公g5! 24. ℤg3 ₩h1+ 25. ☆f2 公e4+ White resigned.

SI 26.14

☐ Luckans

Riga 1993

1.e4 c5 2.�f3 �c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.�xd4 �f6 5.�c3 d6 6.�c4 e6 7.0-0 ♠e7 8.☆h1 0-0 9.f4 d5!

After the pseudo-sacrifice 9... £xe4 10. £xe4 d5 White is left with a slightly better position after 11. £xe6 bxe6 12. £d3 dxe4 13. £xe4, which is why the text is more accurate.

10. △xc6 bxc6 11. △d3 c5

Alternatives are 11...\u00edc7!? and 11...\u00edb7!?, according to the black player.

12.e5 @d7 13.@xh7+!?

This book contains several examples with this bishop sacrifice, invariably resulting in a winning attack for White. Here, however, the move yields no more than a draw, because White is quite low on attacking potential.

13... \$\psi\$ 14. \$\psi\$ h5+ \$\psi\$ g8 15. \$\psi\$ f5 16. \$\psi\$ h6!?

After 16... \$\mathbb{\text{"}}\mathbb{e}'8\$ White has perpetual check with 17. \$\mathbb{\text{"}}\mathbb{h}'7 \text{-st}'7 \text{18.} \$\mathbb{\text{"}}\mathbb{h}'5 + \mathbb{\text{-gg}} \text{19.} \$\mathbb{\text{"}}\mathbb{h}'7 +. The text is an attempt to keep the fight going. \text{17.exf6} \text{ \text{\$\x}\$\$\$}\ext{\$\text{\$\$\exit{\$\text{\$\x}\$\$\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\t

After 18.豐h7+?! Black could safely have played 18...查f7 19.豐h5+ g6.

18...d4 19.⊕e2 **₩e8**After 19...**£**b7 White can regroup with 20.⊕g1, followd by ⊕f3.

20.要h7+ 会f7 21.要h5+ 会g8

Black resigns himself to the draw. According to Lanka, White would have been slightly better after 21... 金e7?! 22. 實乃, while after 21... ge?! White would also have played 22. 實行.

22.@h7+ @f7

Rauzer Variation

Black plays 2... ac6 and 5...d6, White plays 6. ag5

SI 27.4

☐ Zarnicki ■ Roman

Buenos Aires 1994

1.e4 c5 2.013 0.c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4

2.16 5. 2.63 d6 6. 2.95 2.d7 7. 2.x16
Consistent, although White usually postpones taking on 16, since the drawback of 2.d7 is that after e7-e6, 2.c3-b5 tends to be a good move. 7. 2.42 or 7. 2.62 is more common.

7...gxf6 8...2e2 ₩a5
The alternatives are 8... In 28 and 8...₩b6.



Black would like to swap queens, after which he no longer needs to fear a king attack. He then plays f6-f5 to swap his doubled pawns, and with two active bishops he has nothing to grumble about. Too enthusiastic is 11...Ixc2 12.b4 響a3 13.並d1! 显c8 14.並b3, after which the white attack gathers real strength.
12.實d2 響xc2 13.響e3 響c5

14.響f4 響d4 15.Eac1 含d8 16.b4!!



Beautiful. It's hard to believe, but the hunt for the black queen has already started. 16...26 17.Ec4 Wb2

After 17... \$\vec{\pmathbb{e}} = 5\$ White plays 18. \$\vec{\pmathbb{e}} = 1\$, and the pin on the c-file is beginning to irritate.

18. \$\vec{\pmathbb{e}} = 4\$ e6

Certainly not 18... \$\vec{w}\$xa2; after 19. \$\vec{w}\$f5! White is already threatening mate.

19.@c3! The net is being closed.

19... êe7 20. \$\bar{\pma}\$ b1 \$\bar{\pma}\$ c2 21. b5 \$\hat{\pma}\$ d7 22. \$\bar{\pma}\$ xc8 + \$\hat{\pma}\$ xc8 23. \$\bar{\pma}\$ e3 f5 24. b6!

The point of the intermediate move 24.b6 is illustrated by the variation 24. 2d1 f4 25. 2d4 e5 26. 2d. 2d6, and now White has no check on c7.

24...a6 25. ad1 Black resigns.

SI 27 9

☐ Milov

sharp play.

Bad Wörishofen 1997

1.e4 c5 2.⊕13 ⊕c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 ⊕f6 5.⊕c3 d6 6.⊕g5 e6 7.⊕b5 ∰b6
A typical Rauzer move. The main line after 7...@d7 8.@xc6 bxc6 9.∰f3 can lead to very

8. xf6 gxf6 9. 2d5!?



This spectacular move may not be good, but it is the only way to refue 7... #b6. After quieter moves Black has no problems.

9...exd5 10.exd5 a6 11. #e2+

11.\(\pexac4\)? loses after 11..\(\perac45\) + 12.c3 \(\perac4\)? (certainly not 13..\(\perac4\) xdd 1+?? 14.\(\perac4\) xdl! \(\perac4\) 7 15.\(\perac41\)! xdd 7 15.\(\perac41\)! xdd 7 15.\(\perac41\) + and the black king has no escape square) 14.\(\perac42\) 2 \(\perac42\) xez \(\perac47\) winning a piece.

11...

dd8 12.

xc6+ bxc6 13.

xc6

ar At first sight, White has a fine position: the black king is exposed, Black's pawn structure has collapsed and White already has two pawns for the piece. The reason that Black is very good here is that White has no real attack, which means that Black calmly development.

ops and then launches an attack himself.

Snatching pawns with 14.\(\vec{w}\)e8+ \(\phi\)e7- \(\phi\)b15.\(\vec{w}\)f17+ \(\phi\)b8 16.\(\vec{w}\)f3.\(\vec{w}\)f4 (\vec{w}\)f3.\(\vec{w}\)f4 (\vec{w}\)f3 (\vec{w}\)f3

14... \(\mathbb{I} = 7\) 15. \(\mathbb{I} = 7\) 15. \(\mathbb{I} = 7\) 15. \(\mathbb{I} = 7\) 15. \(\mathbb{I} = 7\) 16. \(\mathbb{I} = 7\) Activating the rook. The greedy 16... \(\mathbb{I} = x\) xb2 is

punished beautifully: 17.2b1 #xc2 18.2fc1 #d2 19 #b3 #a5



20.\(\hat{a}\)d7!!\(\hat{\text}\)d721.\(\bar{\text}\)e2!\(\bar{\text}\)e522.\(\bar{\text}\)a4+\(\hat{\text}\)d8
23.\(\bar{\text}\)xc5 dxc5 24.d6, and White wins the attack

17.h3 Wb4 18.c3 Wxb2!?

And again this move is not good! 18... #h4! 19. #a 20. #a

19. #d3 _eh6 _20. #d4 #d2 _21. #b6+ Ec7 _22. h4?

Incomprehensible. After 22.\(\mathbb{L} = 7\)! \(\psi \times 7\)
23.\(\mathbb{L} \times 7 + \psi f 6\)
24.\(\mathbb{L} \times 46 + \psi g 7\)
25.\(\mathbb{L} = 5 + f 6\)

26. 響e7+ \$h8 27.d6 \$18 28. 響d8 it is very doubtful whether Black has more than a draw. 22... 第次62 33.187 \$\phi_{27}\$7 24. 第次67+ \$\phi_{6}\$6 25. 晋xd6+ \$\phi_{9}\$7 26. 響c7 響f6 27. 其d1 用d8 28.d6 \$\phi_{4}\$4 White resigns.

SI 27.9

☐ Nilsson

■ Geller

Stockholm 1954

1.e4 c5 2.©f3 ©c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.©xd4

1f6 5.©c3 d6 6.©c5 e6 7.©xc6 bxc6

8.e5
A suggestion from the German master Kurt
Richter. The idea is to take the initiative

quickly after 8 dxe5.9 \mathbb{\mathbb{g}f3

8...\#a5! 9....b5



A beautiful interference. I can well imagine the excitement of the inventor of this move, as well as his grimly fanatical attempts to defend it. In these days of modern weaponry this move would certainly not find favour. White's last chance is 9, £x160 gxf6 10.exd6 #e5+(I am afraid that after 10...£88 11.#d4 £xb2 12.0-0.0 £b7 13, £d3 White is skating on very thin ice) 11.#e2 £xd6 12.0-0.0, which looks plavable.

9...cxb5 10.exf6 b4 11.@e4

A simultaneous game by Richter finished quickly after 11.\(\exists \) f3 bxc3?? (11.\(\exists \) gc5+! puts a spanner in the works) 12.\(\exists \) fc6+\(\exists \) d7 13.\(\exists \) xa8+\(\exists \) d8 14.\(\exists \) d8 42 h6

11...\(\exists \) g5 12.13 d5 13.\(\exists \) d2 h6

Resisting the temptation: 13...dxe4? 14.0-0-0 #d5 15.fxg7 &xg7 16.#e3 &xb2+ 17.\$\psi\$b1, and White is winning again.

After 23.Exc2 the check 23... a1+ decides.
23... xc1+
White resigns.

SI 28.2

☐ Oll
■ Temirbaev

Kuibyshev 1986

1.e4 c5 2.②f3 ②c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.②xd4 ②f6 5.③c3 d6 6.②g5 e6 7.豐d2 ②e7 8.0-0-0 0-0 9.①b3 a5

8.0-0-0 0-0 9. €b3 a5
Blacks immediately swings into action. By advancing the a-pawn he wants to create chaos in the white camp. On the downside, this kills the dynamism on the quenside, as the

black pawns can now easily be blocked.

A principled move. White blocks the a-pawn and takes firm control of square b5. Slightly more subtle is 10.a3 a4 11.2d4, with roughly the same kind of position, only with the plus that the white a-pawn cannot become weak. 10..d5 11.b5 50b4

Black can take on e4 here, but after both 11... \(\)

14. \$c4 h6 15. \$xf6 gxf6 16. \$\times xe4 f5 17. \$\times d6\$, White has a firm grip on the initiative.

12. \$\times he1\$

The game can also be shepherded into a more positional direction: after 12.e5 ©d7 13.axe7 ₩xe7 14.f4 White is slightly better. 12..h6

Black sheds a pawn to speed up his development.

13. £xf6 £xf6 14.exd5 exd5 15. £xd5 £g4 16.f3 £f5 An attempt to get into the game by switching

An attempt to get into the game by switching moves fails miserably: 16...&g5 17.\(\text{Qe7}+1\) \(\text{2xd8}\) \(\text{2xd8}

White is demanding too much from his position. After the simple 17.♠xb4 axb4 18.∰xd8 Efxd8 compensation for the pawn will be very hard to find.

17... 25 18. 2d4 2g6 19.g3 2xe3 Not bad either is 19.. 27 20.f4 2f6, with dangerous attacking play, 21.f5 2h5 22.g4, for instance fails to 22. 2f68

20. wxe3 Ic8 21. Id2 wd5 22.b3 Ifd8 23.c3 wc5 24. ac4 心d5 25. axd5 Ixd5 26. ab2?



Now White succumbs because his queen is dangerously overloaded. After 26. 它b5 基xd2 27. 變xd2 豐f5 28. 查b2 豐xf3 the outcome is

by no means clear.

SI 28.2

☐ Tal

■ Mohrlok

②16 5. ○c3 d6 6. 25 e6 7. 2 de 7 8.0-0-0 0-0 9. ②b3

Preparing a dangerous attacking system.

Preparing a dangerous attacking system. White is now threatening £xf6, and if Black parries the threat, White launches a king attack. Black has two options: either to try and effect d6-d5 in order to get play in the centre, or to launch his own king attack.

9... wb6 10.f3 a6 11.g4 Id8 Now Black is ready to play d6-d5. 12.2e3 wc7 13.g5 2d7 14.h4 b5 15.g6!



A well-known pawn sacrifice: White opens a few files, which his rooks will gratefully make use of.

15...fxg6

Five years earlier, Tal had beaten Koblenz in

improbably fine style after 15...hxg6 16.h5 gxh5 17.Exh5 @f6 18.Eh1.

18.h5 gxh5 17. Ixh5 €f6 18. Ig5 ≥e5 flere Black can counter with 18...d5!?, but it is not clear who is better after 19.exd5 54 20. Ig2 €e8 (20...bxc3? loses at once after 21. ILAxg7 + &h8 22. &h6) 21.4xc6 bxc3 22. Ixd8 (the exchange sacrifice after 22. Ixd3!? is certainly worth considering) 22... &xd8 23. Ixd.5.

After 21...費xc4? 22.点b6 單d7 23.公a5 費b4 24 a3 Black loses his queen

22. 4 4 4 5 8 23. 4 h 1 4 b 7 ?!

This seems rather timid. 23...€5 looks normal, but after 24.£de2 (after 24.£de5 the advance 24...d5 gains in strength) 24...d5 25.exd5 ₩57 26.b3 cxb3 27.axb3 £xd5 28.\pm218 Eds. is suddenly in trouble again: 28...g6 is punished with 29.\mathbb{I}xg6+, while 28...£f6 is net by 29.£de.

24.IIh6!



24...\$f7

It cannot have been easy to play against Tal. 24...g6, for example, looks like a good move, but White strikes beautifully: 25.ghxg6+lxg6.26.fkxg6.4cf 727.\@g5.\@c8.28.fkxg6+2g7.27.\@g5.\@c8.28.fkxg6+2g7.28...\@xc6.29.\@xc6.4xg6.30.\@f5+\g7.31.\@d5-kg7.\@d5-kg7.\@d

White wins because of the very unfortunate position of the black pieces. 31.42e6 is the threat.

trireat. 25.≣h4 ₩b6 26.⊘d1 ₩c7 27.f4 h6 28.≣g6 Ie8 29.f5 e5 30.⊘c3! ₩d8

28. Ig6 Ie8 29.f5 e5 30. ②c31 ₩d8 30...exd4 31. Ixf6+ gxf6 32. ②d5 won't save Black either. 31. ③c6

Black resigned.

SI 28.3

□ Baron Rodriguez

■ Meins

Groningen 1998

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 0c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 0f6 5.0c3 d6 6.&g5 e6 7.₩d2 &e7 8.0-0-0 0xd4 9.₩xd4 0-0 10.f4 ₩a5 11.&c4 &d7 12.e5 dxe5 13.fxe5 &c6 14.&d2 &c5!?



puts the knight on g6 and can often make a positional exchange sacrifice. White's chances should certainly be preferred, but it is not a simple position. 14...&c5 has not been played often yet, but Black certainly has more experience with it.

15.₩h4 ົod7 16.≝he1 ₩c7 17.≗d3 g6 18.⊙e4 ≙xe4

This knight is too dangerous to be allowed to

19.Exe4 Efc8! 20.@c3 @f8 21.Ef1

The start of a bad plan. To my mind, White is already beginning to get worse, which is why he would be better off taking prophylactic measures such as 21 & b1

21...②c5 22.單ef4 ②xd3+ 23.cxd3 歡xe5 24.單xf7
White's best bet is the remarkable 24.常d21.

with chances for both sides after 24... \(\pm xc3 \) 25.bxc3 f5.

Far better is 27.豐e7 豐d4+ 28.全e2 豐xb2+ 29.全e3, and it will be far from simple to mate White.

27...里d8+ 28.幸c2 響e2+ 29.幸b3 響xb2+

White resigns.

SI 28.3

☐ Matsuura
■ Tsuboi

Sao Paulo 1997

1.e4 c5 2.全f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.全xd4 公f6 5.全c3 全c6 6.皇g5 e6 7.豐d2 皇e7 8.0-0-0 0-0 9.f4 全xd4 10.豐xd4 豐a5 11.皇b5

When you see this for the first time, you'll probably class it as a Fingerfehler. If that is really what it is, it could have happened to worse players, since both Kamsky and Ivanchuk have played this move against Kramnik.

Its aim is to keep the black bishop away from d7 for another while.

11...a6?!
Succumbs to the temptation. Better moves are 11...h6. 11...\(\textbf{Id} \) and 11...\(\textbf{E} \).

12.e5! dxe5 13.fxe5 @d5 White wins material after 13...axb5 14.@xf6! b4 15.@xe7 bxc3 16.@xf8.

14. xe7 xe7 15. 2d3 2c6 16. The One way of getting an attack without losing a pawn is 16. 2e4 g6 17. 2he1.

16...g6 17.∆e4 ₩xe5 18.∆f6+ фg7 19.Дhf1 h6 20.фb1



White has judged this well: at the cost of only one pawn he has mobilised all his pieces. The only defending black piece is the queen; Black's other pieces have not been developed

White puts all his money on the h-pawn. An attractive option is 28. #f2, threatening mate, which means that 28...#d8 is forced. After 29.0f6 IIh8 White keeps attacking.

28...hxg5 29.\(\pi\xg5+\\delta f8 \) 30.\(\pi f6 \Q\d4

Black collapses. A better defence is 30... [a 8!]
Black collapses. A better defence is 30... [a 8!]
Black collapses. For the black queen) 32.h7 exd3, and after 33. [a xd3] 響e5
34. 資h6+ 空e7 35.hz8署 [a xg8] the win is

31.h6 ₩d5 32.c4 ₩c5 33.h7 \(\hat{\pi}\)xc4
Black resigns.

SI 28.3

☐ Shirov ■ Kramnik Groningen 1993

1.e4 c5 2.\(2\)f3 \(\)c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.\(\)xd4 \\ \(\)f6 5.\(\)c3 d6 6.\(\)g5 e6 7.\(\)gd2 \(\)e7 8.0-0-0 0-0 9.f4 \(\)xd4 10.\(\)gxd4 \(\)gas 31.\(\)c4 \(\)d7 12.\(\)d3

In contrast to the main line, in which he aims for a small plus. White intentions here are very different: he switches his rook to the kingside, lending his attack extra power. The play becomes extremely concrete, meaning that any error will have gruesome consequences.

12... ad8 13. ag3 ah8

Black can play 13...e5 alright, but he will be slightly worse after 14.響d3 兔e6 15.f5 兔xc4 16.豐xc4 d5 17.exd5 公xd5 18.兔xe7 公xe7 19.f6 公g6 20.fxg7 尝xg7.

14.互**f1** Normal is 14.e5 dxe5 15.fxe5 全c6 16.營e3

2g8, with a dynamic balance.

vent a later \(\frac{\pmathbf{I}(8+)}{20.\pmathbf{\omega}} \) 20.\pmathbf{\omega}} xe6 \(\pmathbf{I}(1) + 22.\pmathbf{\omega}} \) xe6, with a position that's hard to assess. Very bad is 16...hxg5? 17.exf6 \(\pmathbf{\omega}} \) xef6 \(18.\pmathbf{\omega}} \) xe6 \(0.9.\pmathbf{\omega}} \) 21.\pmathbf{\omega}} xe7 \(22.\pmathbf{\omega}} \) xe2 \(21.\pmathbf{\omega}} \) xe7 \(22.\pmathbf{\omega}} \) xe2 \(21.\pmathbf{\omega}} xe2 \(21.\pmathbf{\omega}} \) xe7 \(22.\pmathbf{\omega}} xe2 \(23.\pmathbf{\omega}} \) xe7 \(23.\pmathbf{\omega}} xe2 \(23.\pmathbf{\omega}} \) xe7 \(23.\pmathbf{\omega}} xe2 \(23.\pmathbf{\omega}} \) xe7 \(23.\pmathbf{\omega}} xe2 \(23.\pmathbf{\omega}} xe2 \(33.\pmathbf{\omega}} \) xe7 \(33.\p

Taking on f6 is not so good now: 17.exf6

<u>Exd4 18.fxg7+ &h7! (18...&xg7? 19.&xe7+</u>

<u>kh7 20.&f6 <u>Eg8 21.&xd4</u>) 19.&d3+ <u>Exd3</u>

<u>20.&xe7 <u>Eg8 21.</u>&xd3 <u>Exg7</u>, and Black is clearly better</u></u>

A balanced position arises after 17. #e3 @g4 (17...@d5? 18.@xd5 &xg5 19. #xg5 hxg5 20.\(\bar{a}\)13+ \(\phi\)g8 21.\(\phi\)e7 mate) 18.\(\bar{a}\)xg4 \(\pa\)xg5 19.\(\pa\)xg5 19.\(\bar{a}\)xg5 19.\(\bar{a}\)xg5 20.\(\pa\)xg5 \(\pa\)c6.

17...②h5 18.êxh6

Better is 18.營h4 ①xg3 (18...êxg5+?
19.ℤxg5 hxg5 20.營xh5+ ŵg8 21.②c4)



A nice concept, but it's pure bluff.

21.\(\Pi\)fg4 \(\Pi\)xg7 \(22.\Pi\)xg7+ \(\pi\)h6 \(23.\Pi\)g8 \(\pi\)h7 \(24.\Pi\)8g7+

Draw.

SI 28.4

☐ Dvoiris ■ Feher

Budanest 1991

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 @f6 5.@c3 @c6 6.âg5 e6 7.₩d2 âe7 8.0-0-0 0-0 9.f4 h6 10.h4

A frequent theme: White sacrifices his bishop on g5 in order to create dangerous chances along the h-file.

10...@xd4 11.\\xd4 hxq5

Black doesn't have to accept the sacrifice. 11 Wa5 leads to a position in which it will usually take a few moves before either player decides on what to do about the area of tension: nawn h6 and the bishop on g5.

12.hxq5 e5 13.\mathred{\psi}q1

Because of Black's inaccurate 12th move better is 12...@\q4 - White is now offered an alternative route to the h-file. 13.\frac{1}{2} \@g4 14 Wh4 @h6 15 @d5 looks attractive at first cioht

13...@q4 14.@e2 exf4 15.@xq4 @xq5

Too timid. There is no reason not to keep the piece: 15... 2xg4 16. Wh2 f5 (the only move to parry the mating threat) 17. Wh7+ (after 17.g6 Black returns a piece with 17... &h4, when he is no worse in the endgame) 17... \$17. and now it's true that White has a draw with 18.exf5 @xg5 19.\g6+ \g8 20 Wh7+, but after other attempts Black can defend

16 9 xc8 Exc8 17.Ed3 Ee8

This does not look good. 17...f3+ 18. \$\pi\$b1 fxg2 19. wxg2 only helps White.

17... &h6!?, on the other hand, to pre-emptively block the h-file and mobilise the queen with g5, might well be an improvement. 18. ab1 Ic5 19.q3!

Well played. White increases the pressure by opening the g-file as well.

19...fxq3 20.\(\mathbb{I}\)xq3 \(\mathbb{I}\)e6 21.\(\mathbb{I}\)h5 \(\emline{0}\)f6 22. ad5 b6 23. agh3 g6 24. ag5!



After this beautiful move there is no escape: Black no longer has a decent defence against

Black resigns. SI 28.5

☐ Pahlen

■ Enterfeldt

Correspondence game 1992

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 0c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 Øf6 5.Øc3 d6 6.âq5 e6 7.₩d2 âe7 8.0-0-0 0-0 9.f4 h6 10. h4 e5 11. f5 @xf5 12.exf5 exf4

An old line of the Rauzer Black is almost equal, but he still has a few minor problems: White has the bishop pair, more space and more attacking options.

13. 9b1 d5

Black tries to get active by sacrificing the backward d-pawn

14. 2xf6 2xf6 15. 2xd5 2e5 16. 2c4 b5 17. £xb5

White is by no means forced to accept the pawn, In my only encounter with this position I played 17 @b3 and after 17...a5 18.a3 a4 19 @a2 b4 20 のxb4 製f6 21.のd5 製xf5 22 Wd3! I was better

17... Ib8 18.c4

The greedy 18, 2xc6 is too risky. Black can take on b2 with the bishop, but 18... axb2+ 19 del Exa2, with a strong initiative, is prohably better

18...@d4 19. Ehe1 f6 20.a4 a6 21. axa6 □h3 22. 9 h5 ₩a8



The gueen has to leave the d-file before Black can take on b5

23 @h6!?

23.6 c7 looks far stronger. Black's best option then seems to be 23... #c8! 24. De6 Dxe6 25 fxe6 (25.豐d5 罩xb2+ 26.中c1 豐c5 27.fxe6 国b1+ 28.dd2 国b2+ 29.dd3 資a3+ 30 doe4 doh7 leads to a very curious position in which the white king is reasonably safe on c4) 25... 對xe6 26.如a2 算xb5 27.axb5 對xc4+ 28 abl wa4 29. wd5+ abl8 30. me4 wa5. and Black has good counter-chances.

23. Wa7 24. 0d7 Ia8 25. 0xe5 0xb5 26 Wd5+ Wh7 27.cxb5 Wxa4 28.0c4 ₩a2+ 29. c2 Ic8 30. Ib1 Ib4 White resigns.

SI 28 8

☐ Gasseholm

■ Costea

Correspondence game 1985

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 of6 5.0 c3 d6 6.2 a5 e6 7. ₩d2 2 e7

8 0-0-0 0-0 9.f4 h6 10.@h4 @d7 11.@f3 A good idea: the knight avoids being swapped, making it harder for the d7 bishop to be developed, and it also prepares e4-e5.

White normally plays 13, 2d3 here, but opening the g-file is certainly an option.

13...@xq4

A wiser option would be 13... &e8 14.g5 hxg5 15. @xg5 d5 16.exd5 @xd5 17.@xd5 \ xd5. and Black seems to be slightly better again. 14. xe7 2xe7 15. Ig1 2f6 16.f5

Here White can win back his material with 16. 2d5 \wxd2 17. 2xf6+ \wh8 18. 2xd2 gxf6 19.6 c4. of course, but to little avail.

16...exf5

Black would be better off thinking up something else here, although White already has a reasonable attack, e.g. 16... \$\precepf f8 17. \$\precepg g2 @e8 18.f6 gxf6 19.\daggedd d2 @g8 (19...\dagged h5 may be possible) 20.基xg8+! 含xg8 21.變xh6 包g7 22. £b5! (a great intermediate move to keep the black queen away from h5) 22...axb5 23. Eg1 &f8 24. Exg7, and White wins.

17.₩xh6 @g6



18. Exg6! fxg6 19. ac4+ d5 20. ₩xg6 dxc4 21.#a1 @a4

A more stubborn defence is 21...@e8 22.@g5 賞c5 23.賞f7+ \$\psi\$h8 24.\(\bar{\textbf{g}}\)g3 fxe4 25.\(\Delta\)cxe4 @g4 26.單h3+ @xh3 27.響h5+ 如g8 28.@xc5 ②f6 29.₩f7+

\$\delta\$h8 30.a4, but it is obvious that White has very good prospects.

22.4 a5 We5

After 22... £e8 White has several good possibilities, but his best bet seems to be 23. ₩h7+ &f8 24.exf5 ₩e5 25. £c6+ &c7 26. ₩h4+ £cf6 27. 且e1 ₩a5 28. £xg7+ &af7 29. ₩g3, and the white attack strikes home.

23. 2d5 &e6 24. 2f4!



A fine final move. White makes optimal use of the awkward position of the black queen. For example, Black loses his queen after 24...實行 25.贖∏+ ☆閉 26.全xe6+, white 24...實行 is met by 25.豐而+ 母帘 26.全xe6+ 母7 27.豐而+, and the white attack rolls on. Black resigns.

SI 29.2

☐ Diepeveen
■ Van Tubergen

Hengelo 1992

1.e4 c5 2.�f3 �c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.�xd4 �f6 5.�c3 d6 6.₤g5 e6 7.₩d2 a6 8.0-0-0 h6 9.₤h4

This looks like a blunder, 9.\(\hat{a}\)e3 or 9.\(\hat{a}\)f4 are the normal moves. 9.... √xe4 10. ₩f4



A dangerous attacking move. After 10. ♠xe4 ■xh4 11. ♠xc6 ■xe4 there is not much in it for White

10...a5

Black goes after the dark-squared bishop, accepting his crumbling pawn structure. The main line with 10...@5 has a solid reputation. Definitely not good is 10...@16? 11.@xc6 bxc6 12.@c4, and White has too powerful an initiative.

11. ₩ xe4

There are a few other possibilities: 11.62x49! gxf4 12.8x48 9.0x889? simply 12..x48 13.62x66 bx60 14.62x6 8.x48 13.62x66 bx60 14.62x6 8.x48 15.82x64 6.x47 leads to equality 13.62t5 exf5 14.62t6 4.x67 16.62x6 6.x67 16.62x6 6.x7 16

11...gxh4 12.公xc6 bxc6 13.營xc6+ 全d7 14.營f3

This looks better than the more common 14.\(\mathbb{w}\)e4, because it keeps square e4 open for the knight. The position is hard to assess, since both players are holding trumps: Black has the only open files for the black rooks (g and b-file) and a mighty dark-squared bishop, but

his position also has drawbacks: no safe square for the king (18 looks like the best choice) and the black central pawns are vulnerable. All in all, the platitude 'balanced' position seems to fit the bill perfectly.

14...d5?

With the idea of keeping the white bishop away from squares c4 and b3. Correct was 14... 2e7, which for the moment pulls the worst sting from the white attack.

15. û c4!



Well played. White sacrifices a piece to pry open the black king position.

15...dxc4

More stubborn is 15...≣b8 16.⊕xd5 exd5 17.≣he1+ âe7 18.∰f6 ≣f8 19.âxd5 ≣c8, but Black will never get away. 15...âe7? 16.⊕xd5 exd5 17.æxd5 loses at once.

And besides winning a rook with 29.\perpenseq e5+, 29.\perpenseq xc4 isn't half bad either. Black resigns. SI 29.2

☐ Saulin
■ Savon

Tula 2001

1.e4 c5 2.\(\tilde{\Omega}\)1 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.\(\tilde{\Omega}\)xd4 \(\tilde{\Omega}\)6 5.\(\tilde{\Omega}\)c3 \(\tilde{\Omega}\)c6 6.\(\tilde{\Omega}\)5 e6 7.\(\tilde{\W}\)d2 a6 8.0-0-0 h6 9.\(\tilde{\Omega}\)e3 \(\tilde{\Omega}\)xd4 10.\(\tilde{\Omega}\)xd4 b5 11 f4 \(\tilde{\Omega}\)e7 12 \(\tilde{\Omega}\)e7

An interesting move; White wants to take his bishop to f3, where it supports the advance e4-e5. But it costs him his e-pawn, of course.

14.e5 @d5 15.af3 @xf4?

Too greedy, 15... ₩ c7, intending to harass the white knight even more, is better, A possible continuation is 16.£xd5 exd5 17.exd6 £xd6 18.Ent+ 4 x ft 81.9-c.5! £xc5? (falling for it it 19...£xt4 20.£c3 £xd5 x ft 21.exd5 x ft



16.h4

Nice, of course, but 16,exd6 is far stronger: 16... wxd6 (Black has big problems after 16...@g5 17.@e3 @d7 18.@c5) 17.@xg7 \hbf2h7 (the natural 17... \wxd2+? 18.\maxd2 \maxd2 \maxd2 fails to 19. @c6+, and Black has no square left for the king) 18, #f2, and Black has too many holes. 16... 2d5 17.exd6 ≗xh4 18. \$b1 \$q5 After 18...0-0 White also keeps a slight plus: 19.4xd5 exd5 20.4b6! #g5 21.4e3 #g3 22.\psyxd5, and the white d-pawn becomes a tie.

19.We1 @f8?

A third refusal to castle has fatal consequences for Black; White's advantage remains manageable after 19...0-0 20.axd5 exd5 21. We5 &f6 22. Wxd5 &e6 23. &xf6 Wxf6. After 19... \$268? Black is done for.

20. 9 xd5 exd5 21. We5 f6 22. Wxd5 9 d7 23. The1 b3 24.0 c5 bxc2+ 25.0 xc2 IC8 26 - b1 - c6 27 We6 We8 28 Wf5 Black resigns.

SI 29.2

☐ Klovans ■ Vekshenkov

Sverdlovsk 1987

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 @f6 5.@c3 @c6 6.@q5 e6 7.₩d2 a6 8.0-0-0 h6 9.2e3 @xd4 10.2xd4 b5 11.f4 @e7 12.\@e3 \@c7 13.e5 dxe5 14.fxe5 @d7 15.@e4 &b7 16.@d6+ ₩xd6

A remarkable solution

17.exd6 @g5 18.\square xq5 hxg5 19.@xg7 ¤h4

A tabva position from modern opening theory. White is a pawn up and has the bishop pair, which usually militates against the idea of Black playing this. But he undoubtedly has good compensation: all his pieces are develo-

ped, he has great control in the centre and it will take White a while to relieve the pressure on his kingside.



20. a.c3

More common is 20. a.d4, but I think the text is playable as well

20... 0 d5 21.h3 4 c5 Not of course 21 @xa2? in view of 22 b3.

22 Pe5

An artificial move 22 h3 @e4 23 @e1 Th6 24.c4 bxc4 25.bxc4 &c6 (after 25... ac8? 26.d7+ \$\psixd7 27.\$\psib2 White wins a piece) 26. 2e2 \$\psi d7 27. \$\pm f1 f5 28. \$\pm b2 seems more logical to me. White is slightly better, but Black's compensation is also clear

22... Ic8 23.b3 dd7 24. Ih2 Ie4 25. 2f6 If4! 26.皇xg5 If2 27.皇d2?

White ought to have looked for a draw: 27 @e3 @xb3+ 28 @b1 (28 axb3 IIcxc2+ 32. \$\psic 1 \begin{aligned}
\text{ \text{ \psi} \text{ \ 28. @e4 29.@d3 (29.@xf2 @xc2+ 30.@b2 Axd1 31.Axb5+ axb5 32. 算h1 is slightly better for Black) 29... @xd3 30.cxd3 2e2 31. @f4 @d4 32.g4 Exh2 33.@xh2 @f3 34.@g3 Eh8, with equality.

27...@xb3! 28.db2 @a4 29.@e3 Exc2+ 30 cba1 @e4 31 @d3 #2c3 32 #hh1 £xd1 33. xd1 € c5

The remaining endgame is hopeless, so White resigned.

SI 29 11

□ Wang Zili

■ Steingrimsson

Novi Sad Olympiad 1990

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 @c6 6.@q5 e6 7.₩d2 a6 8.0-0-0 h6 9.2f4

Not as well-known as 9, &e3, but certainly not had. The great attraction is that it leads to different set-ups than what is commonly found in the Sicilian

9 0 d7

Black cannot win a piece with 9...e5? 10.6 xc6 bxc6 11.2 xe5, and the queen on d8 is not covered.

10.@xc6 &xc6 11.f3 d5 12.\exists e1 &b4 13 a3 @a5 14.@d2

If White now plays e4-e5 at some stage, the positions are beginning to look a lot like those in the Tarrasch variation of the French! White can also take a more frivolous approach, but after 14.b4 @b6 15.exd5 @xd5! 16.@e5 0-0 it would be hard to show an advantage.

14 @ c7

Black has a wide choice: 14 #e7. 14... \$\bar{a}\$c8. 14...d4!?, 14...0-0 are all possible and eminently playable. 15. ¢b1



15...\bar{w}b8?

This is asking for problems. It was high time to castle: 15...0-0 16.e5 @d7 17.f4, and the game is only starting.

16.exd5 @xd5 17.@xd5 @xd5 18.@b4 @ c6 19. @ c4 a5 20. @ c5 @ e5

Black has only one hope: removing the bishop from the a3-f8 diagonal, after which he can castle 20 b6 fails to 21. axe6. 21.f4

21 @xe6 fxe6 22.\deltade! 0-0 23.\deltaxe5 &d5 24. ad4 If7 do not solve Black's problems either. White is probably winning. 21...b6



22.We4!

Yes, we'll settle for these moves.

22...₩c7 23.âb5 Ic8 24.âxc6+ ₩xc6 25 WYe5

The prozaic 25. ac6+ ac6 26. acb6 acb6 27.fxe5 \$e7 is probably better, but White keeps gunning for the initiative.

25... wxc5 26. wxg7 wxc2+ 27. wa1

de7 28 The1 Thd8? This makes for an amusing finale. 28...\footnote{10.00}\$15

29.g4 響xf4 30.其f1 其hg8 31.響h7 其h8 32. 對d3 當c7 33. 對d4 里h7 looks pretty good for White, but I don't think it would yield him more than a draw.

29 Exe6+ \$xe6 30.₩e5 Mate.

SI 30.3

☐ Ziatdinov
■ Barbero

Montpellier 1994

1.e4 c5 2.\(\text{0f3} \) d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.\(\text{0xd4} \) \(\text{0f6} \) 5.\(\text{0c3} \) \(\text{0c6} \) 6.\(\text{0g5} \) e6 7.\(\text{wd2} \) a6 8.0-0-0 \(\text{0d7} \) 9.f4 h6 10.\(\text{0h4} \) g5 11.fxg5 \(\text{0q4} \)

A personal favourite of mine. Black sacrifices a pawn in order to get a better pawn structure and to reserve the beautiful square e5 for the knight. This leads to lasting compensation in which even endgames are not by definition bad. But a pawn is a pawn, and the variation is definitely treading a fine line.

12.≗e2 @ge5 13.@f3 ≗e7 14.⊑hg1



This ugly move contains a highly original idea. Firstly, it indirectly covers the g5 pawn, but more importantly, it ties down almost all the black pieces: the queen on d8 and the e7 bishop must stay on this diagonal, the knight must stay on e5, and later we will see that the king's rook should preferably remain on h8. The drawback is that a group of white pieces also has to stay where they are

14... II g8?

Correct was 14...b5 in order to create some queenside play

15. ag3 hxq5

After 15... 0xf3 16.gxf3 @xg5 17.f4 @e7

16. xe5 xe5 17. xe5 dxe5 18. h5!
This is the square that the black rook had re-

| Inquished, with fatal consequences.
Lig7	19.Ligf1	g4	20. \psib 1	\hat{\psi} 5	21. \psid 6
\psi 7	22. \psix xe5	\hat{\psi} he	23. \psi fe	\psi g5	
24. \hat{\psi} xf7+ \psi d8	25. \psi xe6				

Black resigns.

☐ Kestler

■ Spassky

Dortmund 1973

1.e4 c5 2.�f3 �c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.�xd4 �f6 5.�c3 d6 6.₤g5 e6 7.∰d2 a6 8.0-0-0 ₤d7 9.f4 ₤e7 10.�f3 b5 11.e5

Traditionally indicated as the best move, but White has an attractive alternative. IL-&xF6 gxf6 12.4bbl Wh6 13.75 0-0-0 14.g3 4b8 15.xe6 fxe6 16.&xH3 &ce Reads to a position in which the black bishop pair will have to assume a defensive role for the moment and the three centre pawns (d6, c6 and f6) are stopped by the white pawn on e4. White has great freedom, but should be careful of a sudden besteroot.

11...b4 12.exf6 bxc3 13.營xc3 gxf6 14.单h4 d5 15.坐b1

White has indisputably the better pawn structure, but the black set-up itself is also quite defensible – he has a reasonable say in the centre and two open files to reinforce his attack.

15...**∂a**5

The direct attack 15... 如b4 16. 如d4 星c8 17. 響b3 響a5 is parried by 18. 血e1! 点a4 19. 響a3 0-0 20.b3 e5 21. fxe5 fxe5 22. 如f5 点c5 23. 響xa4, and White has the last laugh.

This action seems rather ineffective. 16.2d4, in order to grab some squares on the queensi-

de and possibly defend the b-file with @b3, seems to make more sense.

16... IC8 17. 賞d2 賞c7 18.fxe6 fxe6 19. axa6?!

Opening one file too many. White has a clever move: 19. £g31. Its intention is either to provoke e5, after which d5 becomes weak, or to relieve the pressure on c2.

19...⊑a8 20.≜e2 ⊘c4 21.≜xc4 ₩xc4 22.b3 ₩a6 23.c3 0-0 24.⊈a1 d4!



Very aesthetic. Black finds the quickest way to make his bishops count.

25.@xd4

28.挚b1 魚e8, and the bishop is switched to the h7-b1 diagonal with deadly force.

25...e5 26.⊘f3

Slightly better is 26.\(\mathbb{\pi}\)leftel \(\preceq\)g4 27.\(\pi\)f3

(27.\(\mathbb{\pi}\)c1 boses material after 27...\(\mathbb{\pi}\)a3)

27...\(\mathbb{\pi}\)f5 28.\(\mathbb{\pi}\)e3 \(\mathbb{\pi}\)d8, with similar turns as in the same.

in the game

SI 30.10

☐ Runnby

Schneider
Boras 1979

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 ⊘c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 ⊗f6 5.⊕c3 d6 6.≜g5 e6 7.⊯d2 a6 8.0-0-0 ≙d7 9.f4 b5

8.0-0-0 2d7 9.f4 b5

Quite a logical move. Black loses no time to start action on the queenside and forces

Black would prefer to take on 16 with his queen in order to preserve his pawn structure, but 10... ₩x16 is met by 11.c5! (exploiting the position of the bishop on d7) 11...dx5 12...dxb5 № 348 13.5.46+ £x46 14.₩x46 exf4 15.£c44, and White already has a dangerous initiative.

11.f5

White usually prepares this action to put pressure on e6 with 11.5 bl to ensure that he will not be troubled by the following manoeuvre.

Black has beautifully redirected his worst bishop to the best square, e5, where it plays both a defending and an attacking role. 15. \(\frac{15}{3}\) H3

and yielding White the better prospects. 15...岁b6 16.g3 Ic8 17.皇h3 Ic4! 18.fxe6

White would love to chase the irritating rook on c4 away, but 18,b3 threatens nothing at all; Black takes immediate advantage: 18...\$\(\delta\)cc! 19.\$\(\delta\)g2 exf5, and White has already shed two pawns.

18...fxe6 19. 2f4 de7 20. ₩e2

The queen is on its way to g4, but Black gets his retaliation in first.

20... @c6 21. The1 Tc8 22. Tc1? White



White must be extremely careful in view of the enormous black pressure. After 22_M21 everything is still fine: 22...Mb4 23.c3 &xf4 24_gxf4 (or 24_cxb4 &xd2 25_Wxd2 &e8!, also with an open fight) 24...Wx3 is unclear 22...&xb2! 23.0d5+ exd5 24.&xd7 %e5

White resigns.

Sveshnikov Variation

Black plays 2... 2c6 and 5...e5

SI 35.1

☐ Polanski ■ Wydrowski

Correspondence game 1991

1.e4 c5 2.6/13 2b4 7.2c4 4.6/xe4 4.6/xe4 5.6/13 2b4 7.2c4 6/xe4 Alternatives are 7...66 8.0-0 2c6 9.2d5! 5.xe4 10/w62, and White has great compensation for the pawn; or 7...0-0 8.2c6 9.2d5! 5.xe4 is good for Black) 5.xe4 5.xe4 is good for Black) 11.2d2 gxf6, and here White can force a draw with 12.#g4+ 4b8 13.\text{W}h4 or continue by castiling or playing 12.\text{B}1.

8.0-0 @d6



This looks artificial, but it is not easy to refute. After 8...@xc3 9.bxc3 &e7 (the greedy 9...&xc3 10.\(\begin{align*} \be ded in view of the terrible threats on h7 and f7 White has after 11.②g5!) 10.₩d5 0-0 11.③xe5 ②xe5 12.₩xe5 d6 Black looks slightly better.

9. ab3 0-0 10.a3

Another possibility is 10. 2d5 2a5 11.c3, and White controls the d4 square, while at the same time setting up \mathbb{E} e1 and 2c2. White has good compensation.

10....âxc3 11.₩xd6 âa5

11...e4 12. \bigcirc g5 \bigcirc g6 13. \bigcirc xe4 \bigcirc e5 14. \bigcirc gd3, with initiative.

12. 2xe5 ≜c7

12...心xe5 13.豐xe5 全c7 14.豐h5 is better for White because he has the better pawn structure, 13.公xf7 互xf7 14.豐d5



14...\#f6?

\$\prescript{\prescrip

SI 35.1

☐ Tsaturian ■ Markauss

Correspondence game 1989

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4

A logical move. White wants to take his knight to e3 as quickly as possible. The big drawback, however, is that Black frees himself immediately.

6...d5 7.exd5 业xf5 8.dxc6 bxc6 9.響f3 豐d7 10.皇g5 e4 11.豐e2 皇e7 12.皇xf6

Consistent. After 12.單d1 響e6 13.響e4 單b8 14.響xe6 fxe6! 15.b3 ②d5 16.魚xe7 ⊈xe7 17.②a4 e3 Black has the initiative, as in Ako-

pian-Yakovich, Rostov 1993. 12... xf6 13. xe4 0-0! 14. xf6+ qxf6



White is a pawn up and the black position is ruined. But White has no reason to cheer at

all, as he won't be able to castle normally, which gives Black a sustained initiative.

15.₩d2

15.豐c4 国fe8+ 16.愈e2 国e4 17.国d1 豐e7 18.豐a6 国e8 19.国d2 is no good either: after the power move 19...愈e6!, threatening 兔c4, White is in big trouble again, since 20.0-0 fails to 20. 愈c8.

15. 單fe8+ 16.少d1 變b7

Better is 16... wc7, which prevents the manoeuvre wc1 and wc3 in view of check on f4. 17.b3?

After 17.\$\pic1! \boxed ad8 18.\$\pic3 \pi b6 19.\$\pic4 21.\$\pix4 20.\$\boxed f1 \pid4 21.\$\pix4 \boxed f2 \text{d4 22.b3} White is actually better.

White resigns.

SI 35.2

□ Zettler

Stummeyer
Neuwied 1993

1.e4 c5 2.ଡ଼ୀ3 ଡିc6 3.d4 cxd4 4.ଡିxd4 ଡିf6 5.ଡିc3 e5 6.ଡିdb5 d6 7.ଡିa3

Although this game is not of particularly high quality, the idea is quite interesting. In a normal Sveshnikov the a3 knight is out of play for a good while, but here it can be activated at once via c4.

I can wholeheartedly recommend the text to anyone without the time or willingness to deleve deeply into opening theory. In the only grandmaster game that I know, Black thought for all of 50 minutes before making a move, which is a good indication of the complexity of the position.

7....£e6

An attempt to refute 7. 2a3 is 7...a6. Now White will have to go 8. 2c4 b5 9. 2e3 in order to deviate, after which 9...b4 10. 2cd5 \(\) xe4 wins a pawn. It is obvious that White
 has compensation here, and I wouldn't mind
 getting a chance to play this position.

8.0c4 Ic8 9.2q5 0d4 10.0e3 Wa5



11.₩d2

12.bxc3 ∰xc3+13.фf1 &e7 is less good, as 14.₩e1 fails to 14...\(\infty\)xe4, because 15.\(\infty\)xe7 runs into the venomous 15...\(\infty\)d2+ 16.\(\infty\)g1 \(\infty\)2f3+, which wins the queen.

11...響b6 12.區b1??

A horrible mistake, with consequences to match. White simply has to play the only often move that covers b2, after which the capture on c3 doesn't work: 12. ₩c1 xc3²! 13.bxc3 £xx4 14.cx4 ₩a5+ 15.c3 exd4 16. €xc21, and White is better.

Bear in mind, however, that Black is not forced to take on c3.

12... Ixc3 13.\(\frac{\pi}{2}\)xc3 414\(\frac{\pi}{4}\)d3 \(\pi\)xc4 15...3\(\frac{\pi}{2}\)xc4 16.\(\frac{\pi}{2}\)d1 \(\phi\)c6 17.b4 \(\frac{\pi}{2}\)c7 18.\(\frac{\pi}{2}\)1 \(\frac{\pi}{2}\)d2 19.\(\frac{\pi}{2}\)d2 22.\(\frac{\pi}{2}\)d2 0- 23.\(\frac{\pi}{2}\)fb 16 62 4.\(\frac{\pi}{2}\)e2 \(\frac{\pi}{2}\)d2 25.\(\pi\)d4 26.\(\frac{\pi}{2}\)d3 exd3 28.\(\pi\)d1 d2+

White resigns.

SI 35.5

☐ Priepke ■ Weber

Correspondence game 1986

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 0c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4

White decides not to exploit d5 and opts for a different approach; he wants to develop an initiative on the queenside with c4, b4 and finally c5. Black, on the other hand, dominates the kingside and therefore wants to start something there.

7...@xd5 8.exd5 @e7

More common is 8... Db8, after which the knight is put on d7, where it controls square c5. Later, after the typical manoeuvre e5-e4, &e7-f6-e5, it can go to f6 to support the attack starting from there.

9.c3 f5

Black has to be careful, as White was threatening to strike with 10.\(\) ad A fer 9...\(\) 26 10.\(\) ad A 27 the point of 9.c3 is revealed: 11.\(\) ad A 267 the point of 9.c3 is revealed: 11.\(\) ad A 267 the point of 9.c3 is revealed: 11.\(\) ad A 265 12.\(\) ad A 37, with a large advantage 12.\(\) ad 126 13.\(\) ac2, and White is calling the shots, 9...\(\) 275 is playable, but Black preferred to have his pawn on 15. 10.\(\) ad 4 ad 47 11.\(\) bd 40.\(\) ad 10.\(\) ad 4 ad 77 11.\(\) bd 40.\(\) ad 51 ad 27 11.\(\) ad 51 ad 27 11.\(\) ad 51 ad 51 ad 51 ad 27 11.\(\) ad 51 ad 51



An attempt by Black to solve his problems tactically. Better is 11... 2g6, but after 12.h4

White has a solid initiative.

12.âc4 êe6 13.₩b3 @f4 14.êxf4 d5 15.0-0-0

I must warn anyone who is planning to try and find improvements for Black in what follows, as 15.\(\hat{\pm}e2\) exf4 16.\(\hat{\pm}d4\) leaves Black with a highly compromised position.

15...dxc4

15... 灣h4 16.魚xd5 饗xf4+ 17. \$\psi 1 賞e4+ 18.魚xe4 魚xb3 19.星d7+ \$\psi 6 20.axb3 fxe4 21.星hd1, also with a large advantage. 16.耳xd8 cxb3 17.星xa8 bxa2 18.\$\psi c2!

White cleverly waits for the rook swap and keeps his hands off pawn a7, after which capture the black rooks could still get active.

18...exf4 19.b3 g5 20.c4 \(\frac{1}{2} \)g7 21.\(\frac{1}{2} \)xh8 \(\frac{1}{2} \)xh6 22.\(\frac{1}{2} \)s \(\frac{1}{2} \)d7 21.\(\frac{1}{2} \)xh8

Although the material is still equal, Black resigned here. Pawn a2 is going to fall, Black cannot develop counterplay on the kingside and in fact he simply enters the endgame an exchange down. Enough reasons for a correspondence player to throw in the towel.

SI 36 1

☐ Gaviria ■ Rodriguez, A

Correspondence game 1995

1.e4 c5 2.ବି13 ବିc6 3.d4 cxd4 4.ବିxd4 ବି16 5.ବିc3 e5 6.ବିdb5 d6 7.ଛg5 a6 8.ଛxf6?!

There is no particular point to this move, unless it is meant to lure one's opponent into uncharted territory!

8...qxf6 9.@a3

After 9...b5 one of the main lines of the Sveshnikov arises. But Black has an interesting additional option.

9...f5 10.\#h5 b5

Too dangerous is 10...d5, with the intention of destroying the white position after 11.0-0-0 2xa3 12.bxa3. A possible continuation

would be 12... 2d4 13. 2xd5 \(\) \(\) \(\) £e6 14. \(\) \(\) £c8 15. \(\) \(\) £xd4! exd4 16. exf5 \(\) \(\) xd5 17. \(\) \(\) Ee1+ \(\) \(\) \(\) 2d5, and White is calling the shots.

11. axb5 axb5 12. axb5 ab7
After 12... ad7 the uncovered rook on a8 is

going to cause Black headaches.

13. £c4 d5



A bold move. We know that Black has no problems after 13...\(\epsilon\) for 14.\(\infty\) 61 \(\epsilon\) 62 \(\epsilon\) 61 \(\epsilon\) 62 \(\epsilon\) 63 \(\epsilon\) 63 \(\epsilon\) 63 \(\epsilon\) 63 \(\epsilon\) 64 \(\epsilon\) 63 \(\epsilon\) 64 \(\epsilon\) 65 \(\epsilon\) 64 \(\epsilon\) 65 \

Better was 14.0xd5 fxe4 15.0-0-0 wd6 16.db1 (Black was threatening wh6, with a queen swap; now he will have to resign himself to a draw) 16...2b8 17.0r4 wf6 18.0d5 with move repetition. 14.exd5 is bad in view of 14...044 and Black takes over the initiative. 14...wdf 7 15.0-0

15.\(\mathbb{w}\)rfs \(\mathbb{w}\)rfs \(\mathbb

15.... d4 16. ₩q5?

After 16. âxb7 ∰xb7 17. ②d5 âg7, preparing ...fxe4, Black is also better, but it will still be a hard slog.

16... Ia6!

After this deadly switch to the kingside, which mobilises all the black pieces, the battle is decided.

White resigns.

SI 37 10

☐ Ramesh ■ Niiboer

Amsterdam 2000

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 0.c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 0.f6 5.0c3 e5 6.0db5 d6 7.xg5 a6 8.0a3 b5 9.0d5 xe7 10.xxf6 xxf6 11.c3



The so-called positional variation. White is aiming for a quieter set-up and tries to play his opponent off the board with simple means

He has that magnificent knight on d.S. of course, and tries to lay siege to pawns a6 and b5 with a2-a4 or to capture the backward pawn on d6. Black certainly has counterplay, after swapping his dark-squared bishop for a knight he is nearly always OK. His plans? Playing ...b5-b4, after which ...bxc3 confronts White with the unplea-

White confuses the position with the one in which Black has castled kingside instead of playing ...\$\delta_g5\$. In the former case Black must not take this pawn in view of 14.\$\delta_5\$. So course. Note that on move 12, \(h^2-h^4\text{ was still possible, since the knight fork on c7 was still in the position.

13... 2xh4 14.g3 2g5 15.2h3 2b7!

After swapping the light-squared bishop, White certainly has compensation, and the bishop is already putting pressure on d5.

16.14 exf4 17.qxf4 2xf4

And realising that it wasn't his day, the Indian resigned.

SI 37.14

☐ Kasparov

■ Lautier

Moscow Olympiad 1994

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 @c6 6.@db5 d6 7.@f4 e5 8.@g5 a6 9.@a3 b5 10.@d5 @e7 11.@xf6 @xf6 12.c3 0-0 13.@c2 Eb8 14 b4

A paradoxical move. White storms forward without having anything to attack. After being played by Kasparov 14.h4 instantly became popular, of course. The idea behind it is that the black bishop can no longer go to the c1-h8 diagonal. It is also the preparation for a rare occurrence in the Sveshnikov – castling queenside and a reciprocal king attack.

14...∕Ωe7

Chastened by experience, black players have decided to ignore the advance h4 and mainly

stick to &f6-e7, &c8-e6, #d8-d7 now, followed by &e7-d8 and &d8-b6, after which they have an acceptable position.

15.0xf6+ gxf6 16.2d3 d5 17.exd5 wxd5 18.0e3 we6 19.wh5 e4?!

This can't be good. More flexible is 19...5 20.0-0-0 \(\text{Wg} \) (the a2 pawn is not captured; taking it is clearly not without risks. Black must be prepared for \(\text{0.15} \) and \(\text{Wg} \) 5. The sum of \(\text{Wg} \) (and \(\text{Wg} \) (by a less of \(\text{Mg} \) (and \(\text{Wg} \) (by a less of \(\text{Mg} \) (and \(\text{Wg} \) (by a less of \(\text{Wg} \) (by a less of \(\text{Mg} \)) (by a less of \(\text{Mg} \) (by a less of \(\text{Mg} \)) (by a less of \(\text{Mg}

20.2c2 b4 21.c4 \$\pm\$h8 22.0-0-0 f5

Looking for dark squares. The white advantage is actually quite visible; safe king position, better pawn structure and more active pieces. 23... Eb6

In the rest it is also hard to indicate alternatives. After 23....f6 24.\(\mathbb{\pi} \) 16 (24.\(\mathbb{\mathbb{\pi} \) 16 (24.\(\mathbb{\pi} \) 16 (24.\(\mathbb{\pi}

24.h5 Ic6 25.wb1 Ic5 26.h6 We5 27.Ih5 Ig8 28.0g4



Black resigns. A beautiful final position; the pin on the fifth rank chases the black queen away. 28...Exp5 29.@xe5 \(\frac{\text{Ext}}{2}\) 30.\(\frac{\text{Ext}}{2}\) 30.\(\frac{\text{Ext}}{2}\) 30.\(\frac{\text{Ext}}{2}\) 40.\(\text{Ext}\) 5 30.\(\frac{\text{Ext}}{2}\) 48+\(\text{Og}\)831.\(\text{Qx}\)17 is mate, while 28...\(\frac{\text{We6}}{2}\)6 is met by the devastating 29.\(\frac{\text{Ext}}{2}\)48.

SI 38.1

☐ Sion Castro

■ San Segundo

Mondariz 1997

1.e4 c5 2.⊘f3 ②c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊙xd4 ∆f6 5.⊘c3 e5 6.⊘db5 d6 7.Ձg5 a6 8.⊘a3 b5 9.Ձxf6 gxf6 10.⊘d5 Ձg7 11.Ձd3 ⊘e7 12.⊙xe7 ₩xe7



Black has managed to swap the annoying d5 knight, but is still saddled with a hopeless punn structure. He has only one option left activating his bishops with a few pans ascrifices. He gladly gives away the pawn on f5, after which the a8-h1 is opened. After c2-c4 he also often sacrifices b5. After the capture Black plays d6-d5 to force the c4 pawn to show its hand. This also mobilises the bishop on g7. But White has several plans of battle: he can put the pawn on c4 to stop d5 for as long as possible; he can accept the material offered and hope that he will not be overruin.

or he puts the c-pawn on c3, which takes the game into slightly quieter waters. He takes only one pawn, which he often returns later against some positional compensation.

13.c4 f5 14.0-0 0-0 15.\dot\f3 f4

A relatively unknown move. The main line is 15...bxc4 16.6xc4 d5 17.exd5 e4 18.\(\tilde{g}\)(c2 \)(e5 19.\(\tilde{g}\)(c2 \)(c3 19.\(\tilde{g}\)(c3 19.\(\tilde{g}\)(c

16.cxb5 \(\frac{\pi}{g}\)g 17.h3 | would prefer 17.\(\frac{\pi}{c}\)c2, parrying the threat \(\frac{\pi}{c}\)d, to prevent White losing a piece after \(\frac{c}{c}\)d, e.g. 17...(5 18.cxf\) \(\frac{\pi}{c}\)dxf5 19\(\frac{\pi}{d}\)fd \(\frac{c}{c}\)dxf5 29\(\frac{\pi}{c}\)dxf5 28\(\frac{\pi}{c}\)dxf5 28\(\frac{\pi}{c}\)dxf5 28\(\frac{\pi}{c}\)dxf5 27.\(\frac{\pi}{c}\)dxf5 27.\(\frac{\pi}{c}\)dxf5 27.\(\frac{\pi}{c}\)dxf5 27.\(\frac{\pi}{c}\)dxf5 27.\(\frac{\pi}{c}\)dxf5 27.\(\frac{\pi}{c}\)dxf5 28\(\frac{\pi}{c}\)dxf5 27.\(\frac{\pi}{c}\)dxf5 28\(\frac{\pi}{c}\)dxf5 28\

17...d5 18.â.c2

18.exd5 f5 19.d6 e4 20.âc4+ \$\displays h8 21.\displays b3

18...f5 19.ab3 19.**wb3** f3 20.**wx**d5+**ab8** 21.**g3** f4 22.**wx**a8 fx**g3**, and Black wins the attack.

1xg3, and 1



A nice overview of the black strategy.

20.exf5

20.exd5 exd5 21.exd5 e4 22.費b3 f3 23.e3

f4 24.g4 h5 is the, by now, well-known story. So it was high time to pull the emergency break with 20.exd5 e 4 21.h4 響xh4 22.臀h3 響xh3 23.gxh3 âd7 24.0c4 axb5 25.0b6 ad8, and Black is only slightly better.

SI 38 1

☐ Velimirovic

Simic

Cetinje 1991

1.e4 c5 2.少f3 公c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.公xd4 cf6 5.少c3 e5 6.0db5 d6 7.总g5 a6 8.0a3 b5 9.总xf6 gxf6 10.少d5 点g7 11.点d3 2e7 12.②xe7 wxe7 13.c3 f5 14.exf5 d5 15.公c2 0-0 16.0-0 点b7 7.wh5

An interesting idea. White takes a few important kingside squares away from the black queen, at the same time forcing Black to show his hand, as the threat f6 cannot be ignored. 17...e4 18.≜e2 ≝ad8 19.⊕e3 ≝d6?!



This is clearly less good. Correct is 19...d4, which led to the following fine draw in De Koning-Pahlen, correspondence game 1993: 20.cxd4 Exd4 21.&d1 Ed2 22.&b3 Exb2

23. **国**adl **由**h8 24. **②**g4 e3 25. **②**xe3 **w**xe3 26. fxe3 **E**xg2+27. **由**h1 **E**g5+28. **w**f3 **2**xf3+29 **E**xf3 **2**e5 30.e4 f6, draw.

White can deviate at will, of course, but Black's activity along the d-file and the diagonal yields him sufficient counterplay.

20. Zad1 Zfd8 Black would like to play 20. Zh6, but a

Black would like to play 20... \$\begin{align*}
1.f6! \begin{align*}
\text{\text{\text{wxf6}}} & 22.\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{wxf6}}}}}} & 23.\text{\ti}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texit{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{

21.∕∆g4

A beautiful set-up: with his queen, knight and pawn White has full control of the kingside. Besides, Black always has to keep an eye open for f6.

21... ac8 22. #fe1 b4?

A thematic breaking move in the Sveshnikov, but here it backfires.

23.c4 dxc4

24.基xd6 響xd6 25.皇xc4 響d2 26.全f6+ Black resigns.

SI 38 2

☐ Kapengut ■ Bukhman

Minek 1977

1.e4 c5 2.\(\tilde{\Omega}\)f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.\(\tilde{\Omega}\)xd4 \(\tilde{\Omega}\)f6 5.\(\tilde{\Omega}\)c3 \(\tilde{\Omega}\)6 6.\(\tilde{\Omega}\)db5 d6 7.\(\tilde{\Omega}\)f4 e5 8.\(\tilde{\Omega}\)g5 a6 9.\(\tilde{\Omega}\)a3 b5 10.\(\tilde{\Omega}\)xf6 gxf6 11.\(\tilde{\Omega}\)d5 f5 12.g3 fxe4 13.\(\tilde{\Omega}\)g2 \(\tilde{\Omega}\)e6

13... £f5 is beautifully refuted by 14.f3! £g7 15.fxe4 £e6 16.0-0 0-0 17.c3, with a lasting advantage.

14. axe4 aq7 15.0-0

15.②f6+ 盒xf6 16.盒xc6+ 唸e7 17.盒xa8 wxa8 is known to give Black good compensation for the exchange, while 15.豐h5 互e8 16.直目 仑e7 17.c3 公xd5 18.盒xd5 wd7 19.0-0 互e5 won't trouble Black too much eit-

her, as he successfully breaks through the blockade on d5.

15...**≣c8**

19 @xh5!

15...0-0.

An inspired attacking attempt. The positional threat is f4-f5, so Black has to react at once...

16...exf4 17.0xf4 &xb2 18.0xe6 fxe6



19...費b6+!

19...axb5 loses quickly: 20.豐h5+ 全d7 21.宣f7+ 仓e7 22.豐xb5+ 全c7 23.豐b7 mate. 20.**少h1** 豐**xb5**

Now 20...axb5 is also bad. After 21.賞xd6 axa1 22.af3 he will have to give at least a queen to prevent being mated.

21. wxd6 & xa1

22. wxe6+ ②e7 23. wf7+ \$d8 24. 里d1+ \$c7 25. wxe7+ \$b8 26. wd6+ \$a7 27. we7+

Pity! The fire must have burnt itself out. After 27. Exal White is better because the black

king vainly looks for a safe haven. 27....\$b8 28.₩d6+ \$a7

Draw

SI 38.3

☐ Luther ■ Reinderman

Venlo 2000

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 0c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 0f6 5.0c3 e5 6.0db5 d6 7.mg5 a6 8.0a3 b5 9.mxf6 gxf6 10.0d5 f5 11.mxb5 axb5 12.0xb5



This piece sacrifice has always been watched with Argus' eyes and viewed as a surprise weapon, but it has become popular again of late. And it's true that White gets back a lot, viz. two pawns to start with and often a third one as well (15), he also gets dangerous attacking chances, and once his pawns start moving, White might even have prospects in the endgame.

Black must try to complete his development, after which his active piece play is a strong trump. All in all enough ingredients to expect to see a lot more of this variation in the future.
12... \(\textbf{12} \) a4

Almost the universal reply – logically, because it does not only avoid the knight fork on c7, but also activates Black rook along the fourth rank. Other known moves besides the text are 12... #gg 5, 12... #ga5, 12... #gb8 and 12... #ga7. 13.b4

A multifunctional move that cuts the rook off from the kingside. If the pawn is taken, the b-file is opened to lend the attack against the king extra strength.

13...Exb4

13... ① xb4 14.② bc7+ \$da7 15.c3 ② xd5 16. 數xa4+ \$xc7 17.exd5, with attacking chances. For the moment, the young Englishman McShane seems to be having the last word. After 13... 數件 14.0-0 五寶 15.c3 任 16. 數xa4 互xg2+17. \$xg2 數g4+ he made a draw through perpetual check against the self-same Luther.

14. Dbc7+ dd7 15.0-0 ₩g5 Probably dubious The cheerful queen sacri-

fice 15... #xc7 16.0xc7 dxc7 17.c3 Exc4 18. #h5, with very complicated play, is the main line, but check out Shirov's incredible Zwischenzus 16.c319.

16.⊕xb4 ⊕xb4 17.c3! ⊈xc7 18.cxb4 fxe4 19.₩a4



There's nothing spectacular about it, but I wouldn't be surprised if White was already

winning. Black's problem is that his king is just not in time to make it to safety (square f6 in this case) to rebuff the invasion along the c-file

19 9h3 20 Eac1+ dods 21 響a8+ doe7 22.Xc7+

After 22... 如f6 23. Wd8+ 如g6 24. Wxg5+ \$xg5 25.gxh3 Black loses a bishop. 22... 0 d7 23. Wb7 Wf5 24. Ifc1 Ig8 25. xd7+ ce6 26. c8 xq2+ 27. xq2 ₩f3+ 28.\$q1 ₩q4+ 29.\$f1 ₩h3+

30. ce1 Black resigns.

SI 38 8

☐ Andersson ■ Norevall

Correspondence game 1991

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 ②f6 5.公c3 e5 6.公db5 d6 7.âq5 a6 8. 9a3 b5 9. xf6 axf6 10. ad5 f5 11. @d3 @e6 12.0-0 @xd5

The right moment to swap. One move on, and it would have been too late: 12... 2g7 13. Wh5 &xd5 14.exd5 @e7 15. £xf5 loses a pawn.

13 evd5 @e7 14 @xb5 An attempt to cash in. The main line starts

with 14.c3. 14... g7 15.4c3 e4 16.4c4 #a5

17. Xb1 White cannot keep the pawn, as 17. #d2 #c8 18.公xe4? 實b6! 19.實g5 夏g8 20.公d2 요xb2 21.響e3 響xe3 22.fxe3 êxa1 23.罩xa1 allows Black to win an exchange.

Also known is 17.0e2 @xb2 18.2b1 @e5. with chances for both sides

17... 9 xc3 18.bxc3 Wxc3 19.We2 0-0 20 Th6

White is eveing the b-file and a6. But the black knight is better than the white bishop and can dangerously penetrate the white camp. 20.2xa6 @xd5 (20... we5 21.2c4

@xd5 22.@xd5 Wxd5, also with equality) 21. kb7 Ia5 22. kxd5 Ixd5 23. Ifd1 Ixd1+ 24. 響xd1 響c6, with great drawing potential, would have been wiser. Maybe Black can give a nawn, analogously to the game.

20 We5 21 Wd2 f4 22 Ee1 Efb8! 23.\b4

An attempt to improve his position after 23 Tb3 fails to 23 Tc8! (23 Txb3? 24.axb3) 24.ûd3 f5 25.c4 \dd 26.\dd xf4 @g6 27. Wxf5 exd3, and White has too weak an at-

tack for the piece. 23... Ixb6 24. wxb6 Ic8!

Activating all his pieces, while White is frenetically trying to cover his pawns.

25. Wxa6 II c5 26.h3?

Giving away a vital square, gratefully received by Black, But White's position was already dodgy enough as it was!

26...e3 27. cf1 @f5 28. cb3 Ic3 29. wa5 ₩f6!



Black is ready to strike; f4-f3 and exf2 are hard to parry. If White plays f2-f3 himself. Black launches h4 and we5. Moreover, the pawn on e3 is an magnificent trump.

30. Ee2 exf2 31. Exf2 @q3+ 32. dq1 ₩e5

White resigns. He is nowerless against the threat of 33... #e1+. After 33. #d8+ &e7 34, \$\pmuh2 Black calmly plays 34...h6, and there is no perpetual check.

SI 38 9

☐ Brodsky ■ Kramnik

Kherson 1991

1.e4 c5 2.013 0c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 8. 0 a3 b5 9. 2 xf6 gxf6 10. 0 d5 f5 11. ad3 ae6 12. wh5

With both 12 Wh5 and 12.0-0 White is aiming for the position after 12...2g7 13.0-0 f4, which is known to be good for White. See Lutz-Babula, But in both cases Black has an important deviation. After 12.0-0 this is 12... xd5 13.exd5 @e7, as we saw in the previous game Andersson-Norevall.

12... Ig8!

This move has become part of the standard equipment of every Syeshnikov player. Black gladly gives away the h-pawn in order to provoke further weakenings.

13.0-0-0?! Exg2 14.f4

Blocking the c1-h6 diagonal and bringing \mathbb{\extraction}f3 into the position. But White is already too late. 14. #f3?! at once is met by 14... 其g4! 15.exf5 not be recommended) 15 @xd5 16 Wxd5 分b4 17.數b3, and Black is better; he controls the position and has the more active pieces. 14...@d4 15.@e3

After 15 c3 @xd5 16 exd5 White is besieved as follows: 16 b4 17 cxb4 \bb h6 18 \bb h3 重c8+ 19.\$b1 ■xb2+ 20.\$xb2 費xb4+ 21. da1 €\b3+, and he will soon be mated. 15. \ lng1 is met by 15...fxe4 16. \ lng2 exd3, also with chaos in the white camp.

15... If2 16.exf5

16.公xf5 总xf5 17.exf5 基xf4 18.基hf1 響h4 19. 資xh4 算xh4 is clearly better for Black. 16... @ xa2

The first knot in the weaving of the mating net. 17.fxe5

An amusing sequence is 17.0g4 Ec8 18 @xf2 @h3 mate!

17...dxe5 18.@xb5 @h6!!



19.¤he1

After 19 Wxh6 Exc2+ it is mate in one: 20 € xc2 € b3 mate, or 20 € xc2 € e2 mate. 19 axh5 20 axh5+ de7 21. Wh4+ f6 22. #xf2 &f7 23. &d3

White has managed to win the exchange, but the black attack has by no means run out of steam 23 b3 for example, with the idea of blocking the a-file, loses after 23... #c7 24 @a4 @xb3 25 #xd4 exd4 26 dbl @a2+ 27 dbya2 dbf8

23 Wh6 24 0e4 Ta2 25 c4 0xc4 26 dbh1 wa5 27 @d5+ @vd5 28 wvd4 2a1+ 29. c2 2xd1 30. wxd1 wa4+

31.cbc3 And White simultaneously resigned in view of 31 Wc4 mate

SI 38 9

☐ Von der Wiel ■ Reinderman

Brussels 1993

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 9c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 @f6 5.@c3 e5 6.@db5 d6 7.âg5 a6 8.@a3 b5 9.&xf6 qxf6 10.@d5 f5 11. ad3 ae6 12. wh5 I a8 13.c3

Over the years. White has tried all kinds of moves here, but never with the desired result These days, 12. \$\vec{w}\$h5 has virtually disappeared from tournament practice, which makes it a good surprise weapon.

13... Exq2

The most reliable alternative is 13... 2xd5 14 exd5 @e7 as the telex match London-Amsterdam, 1984, had already shown! 14. #f3 I a4 15.exf5

Here 15.h3 is very subtle; the idea is to reserve the g-file for the white queen. Play could then continue 15 . Th4 16.exf5 @xd5 17. Wxd5 @e7.18 \@o2.d5 and here 19.@xb52! (better is 19 Øc2 e4 20 Øc2, when Black can become active but must be extremely careful to prevent his centre from collapsing) is too enthusiastic in view of 19... #b6.

15... axd5 16. wxd5 @e7 17. wb7 ah6 Certainly not 17... wb8? in view of 18. 2xb5 axb5 19 @xb5+ cbd8 20 Wd7 mate. Plausible is 17 Wc8 18 Wyc8+ Gyc8 19 Gc2 Gb6 with a pleasant endgame for Black. 18.f6



18...@a6?

Giving away a vital tempo, and now Black is lost. Seven years later Reinderman played 18 4 g8! 19 Wc6+ (the combination with 19 Idl has no impact now: 19. @xf6 20 Wc6+ cbc7) 19 cbf8 20 Ed1 Ef4 against yours truly, with an equal position, 19. Id1 @h4 20. 2e2 Ig6 21. ₩c6+ wf8 22. Exd6 #e8 23. #xe8+ 4xe8

The queens have been swapped, but there are still tactical possibilities.

24.2d3 Iq4 25.Ixa6 Id8 26.ee2 @q2 27 0 vh5+ cbf8 28 Ed1 e4 29 Evd8 Mate

SI 38 12

☐ Lutz

■ Babula

German Bundesliga 1999

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 e5 6.@db5 d6 7.@q5 a6 8. a3 b5 9. xf6 gxf6 10. d5 f5 14.c4 bxc4 15. @xc4 0-0

A tabya position. White has firm control of square d5, the c-file is suitable for an invasion. and pawns a6 and d6 are weak. Black holds square d4 for the moment, as the a3 knight is still out of play, and the pawn on f4 gives him some slight attacking chances. But he should take into account that the dynamic ... \$\psi h8 and f7-f5 are often followed by @xf4.

All in all, White is clearly better, although there is considerable potential for a draw. 16 Tac1 Th8 17 h3

After 17. axa6 分e7 18. 分xe7+ 資xe7 White must return a pawn, as 19,63? hands Black the initiative after 19 . \$\bar{\pi} a8.20 \$\bar{\pi} c6.\$\text{\te}\text{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\texi{\texi{\texi{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\texi}\text{\texi}\text{\t 17... 學a5

The idea behind 16 Th8 and 17 Wa5 is to swap both a-pawns, which gets rid of one black weakness. The main line is 17 . Wd7. 18.4\c2!

Far more dangerous than 18. 2b1 &h8 19. 4fd1 ※xa2 20 かbc3 ※a5 21 草a1 ※c5 22 草xa6. after which White has only a minor plus.

18 Wya2 19 @ch4! A spectacular idea that throws the entire set-up with 17... #a5 into doubt.

19...@xb4

19... axb4 20.€\xb4 €\xb4 21.\@xe6 fxe6 22 IIc7 4h8 leads to transposition of moves with the game, while 22... wxb3 23. Ifc1 wh8 loses because White can take on g7, and Black is soon mated

20. 0e7+ ch8 21. xe6 fxe6?

Black's last chance is 21... \$\mu\$b7, although White has many ways of aiming for an advantage, e.g. 22.2f5 h6 23.0c8! wxb3 24.2b1 #c3 25.@xd6 #c7 26.@g4, and with the knight getting to f5 it is clear that White is better.

22.0 a6+ da8 23.0 xf8 Exf8 24.Ec7 **10h8**



25. Ifc1?

Squandering the full point. White could have won by making proper use of the several mating threats and the open c-file: 25. #g4! #g8 26. wxe6 h6 (Black was forced to make an escane hatch) 27. Ec8 Ef8 28. Exf8+ exf8 29.響行 âg7 30.罩c1 公c2 31.響f5!, and after this power move White wins a piece and the game

25... Wd2!

Sticking to the rook on cl.

26.\daggeraf a5 \quad \quad a6 \quad 27.\quad a6 \quad h6 \quad 28.\daggeraf a6 \quad af8 29. \$8c7 \$48 30. \$26 \$48 31. \$8c7 Draw.

SI 38 13

☐ Mokry ■ Lanc

Budanest 1981

1.e4 c5 2.013 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 @f6 5.@c3 @c6 6.@db5 d6 7.@f4 e5 8. 2 a 5 a 6 9. 4 a 3 b 5 10. 2 x f 6 q x f 6 11. 0d5 f5 12.exf5 @xf5 13. #f3?!

The early days of the Syeshnikov must have been a great time. White is going to win material, accepting that this allows Black a speedy development

13 Ød4 14 Øc7+

An attempt to make a draw goes wrong after 14.9/f6+ \$e7 15.9/d5+ \$e6!.

14... # xc7 15. # xa8+ &e7 16.c3 b4! The position must be thrown open as quickly as possible, before White gets around to castling. 17 cxh4

17.cxd4 bxa3 would definitely cost a rook.



17. Wh6

Long debates have raged about the question of whether 17.... h6 leads to a win. The text. however, is extremely dangerous.

18. @ xa6

Less good is 18 @c4 \widetilde{w}xh4+ 19 \pif1 \widetilde{w}xh2. 20. ae1 wxa3, which is now followed by the many checks that make little difference to the final assessment: 21.\#a7+ \psid8 22.\#b8+

盒c8 23.營b6+ \$d7 24.營a7+ \$c6 15.營a8+ âb7 26.營e8+ \$c5 27.營xf7. Black is better, but he can still slip up.

18... #xb4+ 19. c/f1 #d2

After 19... wxb2 20. b7+ xb7 21. xb7 Black certainly has compensation, but he has lost his greatest trump: 'mate'.

20.h4 \(\text{\pi}\)h6 21.\(\text{\pi}\)b7+?

White escapes by the skin of his teeth \(\text{y}\)

White escapes by the skin of his teeth with 21. ₩xh8, and now 21...âd3+ is a draw, of course. Black can still create play with 21...₩b2 22..Æd | ₩xa3 23.âc4 | ₩c3 24.&b3 âd4 25.&g1 @c2+, and Wci3 word be better off to stay away from h2. 21...\$f6 22..Ed 1 Dc8!!

Funnily enough, this mating turn is apparently not obvious, as witness the many games in which 22...\$d3+ was played.

23.∕∆b1

White can dodge mate with 23.\(\mathbb{w}\)xc8 \(24.\mathbb{\text{\omega}}\)xd8 \(\mathbb{\omega}\)d3.\(\mathbb{\omega}\)gamma the final result will be the same.
23.\(\mathbb{\omega}\)xe1+

White resigns.

SI 38.16

☐ Jenni
■ Jelen

Baden 1999

1.e4 c5 2. \bigcirc 13 \bigcirc 1.e6 3.d4 cxd4 4. \bigcirc 16 5. \bigcirc 13 e5 6. \bigcirc 1d5 d6 7. \bigcirc 1 e5 6. \bigcirc 1d5 d6 7. \bigcirc 1 e6 5. \bigcirc 1 e7 6 9. \bigcirc 16 10. \bigcirc 1d5 f5 11.c3 \bigcirc 2 f1 12.exf5 \bigcirc 1x f5 13. \bigcirc 1c2 0-0 14. \bigcirc 1ce3 \bigcirc 16 15 d3 f5

One of the main lines of the Sveshnikov, which leads to a very dynamic position in which nuances in the move order are of great importance. A certain amount of relevant knowledge won't go amiss here. White has two obvious plans: besieging pawns a6 and b5 with a2-a4, but also – and far more popular – the set-up with \(\frac{w}{h}\)5, which yields a lot more in the way of attacking chances.

16. Wh5 Ia7

16...e4 17.âc2 �e7 18.�f4 â£7 19.âb3 d5 20.₩g5, which leads to great complications, is the most common continuation here. 17.âc2

Bad is 18...e4? 19.@f4.

19.@xd5 e4



20.f4!

An amazing move – White takes the time to nip an important counter-action (cc6-e5) in the bud.

20...⊕a5

This manoeuvre is too slow. In my opinion Black should play 20...exf3 e.p., after which White faces the difficult choice of how to castle: 21.0-0-0 (better is 21.0-0 2c7 22.2xc7+ wc7 23.2xf5 wc3-24.Hg2, and White is better) 21...b4 22.2xf5 Mc3-23.2xf5 bcc3 24.bxc3 wa5, and Black has extremely daneerous counter-chances.

Black resigns. 27...黨xh2 28.萬xg7 幸xg7 29.萬g1+ 蒙h6 30.饗xe4 means utter decimation and will soon be followed by mate.

Taimanov and Paulsen Systems

Black plays 2...e6 without 4... 16

SI 39.5

 \square Mnatsakanian

■ Taimanov Erevan 1986

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 e6 5.@c3 a6 6.g3 @ge7

The set-up with the king's knight on e7 is typical for the way Taimanov himself used to play his own variation. 7. ♠ q2

With 7. Db3 White can avoid the exchange on d4, which favours Black.

The moves 9.\(\mathbb{w}\)e3 and 9.\(\mathbb{w}\)d2 have also been played here; not that they are stronger, though. 9...\(\mathbb{e}\)e7

9... 2c5 is also worth considering. 10.0-0 0-0 11.2e3

11.a4 ≝c7 12.≝e2 ©a5 is good for Black, according to Taimanov.

11...b5 12.f4

12. ②d5 is interesting, but not particularly strong: 12...exd5 13.exd5 ₺b7 14.dxc6 ₺xc6 15. ②d4 點c8 16.c3 點c8 17. 點c1 ₺f8, with a roughly equal position, Faibisovich-Taimanow, Leniperad 1973

12...ûb7 13.\e2 \u00e4c8 14.\u00e4f2?!

Better is 14.≣ad1. After 14...@a5 15.⊈h1 @c4 16.Ձc1 the position is approximately equal, Taimanov.

14...@a5! 15.@d1

After 15. âb6 Black can choose between 15... ≝xb6 16. ≝xb6 âc5+, with good play,

and 15...\seconderestime e8!?, after which 16.\text{\pi}xa5? won't work in view of 16...\text{\pi}c5,

15... 2c4 16. £d4 f6 17.c3 17. **₩**e2 e5 18. **£**f2 may be a better idea, ac-

17. ₩e2 e5 18. £f2 may be a better idea, as cording to Taimanov again.

17...e5 18. £a7 ₩c7 19. £h1

The threat was 19... ■a8, followed by 20... ■xa7, and 19. ©c3 would have run into 19... ©xe4.

19... ©c6 20. ©c3

Back with its tail between its legs... 20.b3 is met by 20... 0d6 21. 1e1 1e1 1e3 22. 2e3 exf4 23. gxf4 f5!, with a winning position, Taimanov. 20... 1e5 21. 2e2 d5!

Opening the position like this makes for a quick decision

Icd8 White has a miserable position. 25... 響xg2+ 26.☆xg2 Ixd1

White resigned.

SI 39 10

□ Plaskett ■ Hartston

Uppingham 1986

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 ②c6 5.公c3 a6 6.âe2 公qe7 7.0-0 公xd4 8. 實xd4 公c6 9. 質d3 公b4?!

A better idea is 9...\mathbb{\mathbb{w}} c7, after which the books give the following line: 10.2g5 2d6 11. \$\psi\h1\ f6\ 12. \$\partial h4 & e5\ 13. \$\pi\ d2 & g6\ 14. \$\partial g3\ @xg3 15,hxg3 b5 16,f4 @b7, with a roughly equal position, Lukin-Taimanov, St.Petersburg 1995. The text looks fairly logical, but White can just sacrifice the c2 pawn.



10. # a3! @xc2 11. aa5! f6

Not a beautiful move, but 11...@e7 12.@xe7 ₩xe7 13.₩xg7 is very good for White, of course while after 11. Wb6 12 Fad1 or 11... wa5 12, Zad1 White has good compensation for the pawn, particularly in the shape of a considerable lead in development.

12 @ f4 dbf7

12...@xa1 is refuted, according to Plaskett, by the sacrificial variation 13. Ah5+ g6 14.2xg6+ hxg6 15. #xg6+ \$e7 16.e5, and White wins, e.g. 16...d5 17. ₩xf6+ \$\dot d7\$ 18 要xb8 公c2 19 要b7±

13 9 c7 ₩e8

13... 實e7 is also met by 14. Lad1.

14 Tad1 h52

Now things go rapidly downhill. Better is 14... 6b4, although White has good play after 15.f4

15.e5! @b7

After 15 f5 Black loses even more than the exchange: 16.\(\hat{a}\)f3\(\bar{\pi}\)a7 17.\(\hat{a}\)b6\(\bar{\pi}\)b7 18.\(\hat{x}\)b7 ②
xb7 19. 賞d3 ②b4 20. 賞xd7+ 賞e7 21. 念c5. 16.exf6 &a8

16...gxf6 17.桌h5+ and 16...g6 17.黉d3 don't offer any comfort either.

17.fxq7 @xq7 18.@e5 Black resigned in view of 18... #g6 19. #xg6

SI 39.16

☐ Ulibin

■ Kirov

Cappelle la Grande 1996

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 @c6 5.@c3 a6 6.f4 ₩c7 7.@b3 d6 8. 2e3 @f6 9. 2d3 2e7 10.0-0 0-0 11.q4!? b5 12.q5 @d7 13.\hbar n6

Another idea is 13... Ze8. followed by 14... 公f8. 13... 公b4 14. 直f3 g6 15. 響h6 f5!? is also worth looking at

14. Wh6 Te8 15. Tf3 9f8 16. Wh4 h4 17. Th3 h5 18. Pe2

After 18.gxh6? e.p. bxc3 19.h7+ \$\psi h8\$ the

black king is totally safe. 18...@q7 19.\fif1 @xb2

The books give this move an exclamation mark, but although taking the pawn does look quite suspect and Black loses quickly, things are not at all that crystal clear. Other moves are 19...a5 and 19...@a5.

20.f5 exf5

A tough nut to crack is 20...@de5!?: 21.@f4 exf5 (but not 21...@xd3? 22.@xh5! gxh5 23.f6, and White wins) 22.40d5 (now 22.exf5 @xd3 23.@xh5 doesn't work: 23...gxh5 24.f6 âxh3 25.響xh5 響d7 and 26...響g4+) 22... 實b7 23.分f6+ (23.exf5 分xd3 24 cxd3 is also unclear) 23 . dof8 24 @xe8 doxe8 and although White has won the exchange, the position is extremely unclear.

21 6 14



21...@e7?

Logical enough in itself. Black does not want to allow the knight on d5. But now the white attack quickly strikes home. Correct was 21...@de5! as on the previous move. 22.exf5 @ f8

After 22...@e5, 23.@xh5! is also winning.

23.@xh5! axh5 After 23 @xf5 White has the beautiful winning move 24.@d4!: 24...@xh4 (24...gxh5 25. 響xh5) 25. 心f6+ 由g7 26. 心xe8+ 由g8 27 @xc7 and White stays ahead in material 24. wxh5 @xf5 25. @d4 @h6 26.gxh6 2xh3 27.₩q5+ @q6 28.₩f6

Black resigned. SI 40.1

☐ Rauer

■ Gerusel

German Bundesliga 1986

1.e4 c5 2.013 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0 xd4 a6 5.4c3 \c7 6.q3 4c6 7.4q2 4f6 8.0-0 ⊕ e7

8... 2xd4 9. #xd4 &c5 10. &f4! is regarded as good for White 9 Te1 @xd421

This move has a surprising drawback. A better possibility is 9...0-0; see the game Matulovic-Janosevic.



10 e51

An amusing and strong reply! After 10. #xd4 &c5 Black has reasonable play. Thanks to the wasted tempo he can safely meet 11, 2f4 with 11...d6 12.響d2 ②g4! 13.其e2 ②e5.

10 Øc6

10... 6b5 has also been tried, but this move isn't satisfactory for Black either: 11.exf6 gxf6 12.@xb5 (or 12.@d5!?, an interesting knight sac: 12...exd5 13.2xd5 h5 14.a4 2a7 15. #d4, and White has good compensation. De la Riva Aguado-Plaskett, zonal tournament Mondariz 2000) 12...axb5 13.\dot\g4 \hat{a}f8 14.c3 h5 15.\frac{w}{f5}, with advantage for White. Kindermann-H.Janssen Baden-Baden 1985 11.exf6 axf6

11... axf6 can be met strongly by 12. 2d5. 12. #q4 @e5 13. #q7 @q6

Or 13... #18 14. De4. with advantage for White. 14. e4 After 14. 2 f4 d6 15. Zad1 White is also better

Boudy-Lebredo, Cuban championship 1985. 14...we5

Up to this point everything had been seen before! The game Renet-Marin, Bucharest

144

1984, saw 14...f5 15.@d5 #a5 16.@f4 fxe4 17.@c7+, with advantage for White.

15. £f4 wh5 16. 6 d5!

Now Black is deftly seen off. 16...exd5 17.\(\hat{L}\)xq6 hxq6 18.\(\bar{L}\)xe7+! \(\d\)d8 Or 18... \$\preceq\$ xe7 19.\textbf{E}e1+, and mate. 19 1684

Black resigned: there follows 19... Exe8 20 衛xf6+ Ie7 21 Iel and mate.

SI 40 1

☐ Matulovic ■ Janosevic

Porec 1970

1 e4 c5 2 0 f3 0 c6 3 d4 cxd4 4 0 xd4 e6 5.0c3 #c7 6.q3 a6 7.2q2 0.f6 8.0-0 2e7 9. Ee1 0-0 10. € xc6 bxc6

10...dxc6!? is probably stronger; after 11.e5 Ed8 12.₩e2 or 12.₩f3 White has slightly more space, but it is nothing special. 11 e5 @d5 12 @e4!?

A promising pawn sacrifice. Another move is 12. 2a4, when White remains slightly better. 12... wxe5 13.c4 @f6 14. ag5!?

Unclear is 14 &f4 \\ wxb2 15 \(\infty\) d6 \\ \ wa3 16 単d2 のe8 17 のxc8 草xc8 18 単xd7 Ciric-Janosevic Vrsac 1969



14...₩a5?

White suddenly gets a winning attack. 14... wxb2? is also bad in view of 15. ab1 ₩xa2 16.@xf6+ @xf6 17.@xf6 gxf6 18. Wd4! 如g7 19. 具a1 Wb3 20. 具e4. but after 14...\forall f5 things are not totally clear: in his book The Taimanov Sicilian, Burgess concludes that White still has dangerous play - he suggests 15 o4 but after 15 Wa5 16 @xf6+ @xf6 17.@xf6 gxf6 that pawn is definitely slightly in the way of the white pieces.

15.0xf6+ exf6 16.exf6 axf6 17.2e4 ±h8 18.₩d4 ₩d8

Or 18 ..e5 19.\d6

19. Th4 d5 20. Th6! e5

No better is 20... \$\preceq g7 21. \$\preceq h4 \$\preceq h8 22.\$\preceq d1.\$ with the threat of 23, &e4. After 22...f5 White wins with 23. Exh7+!, while 22... 2b7 is met by 23. ad4 f5 24. ah5.

21. Wh4 @f5 22. @h3! @g6 23. Exh7+ Black resigned in view of 23... 2xh7 24.2f5, and mate

SI 40.2

Hector

■ Mortensen

Beykiavik 1995

1.e4 c5 2.613 0 c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.6 xd4 8.0-0 @b7 9.0b3 @e52!

A more solid idea is 9 @f6 10 f4 d6 transposing to a Scheveningen set-up. 10.f4 @c4

10...@xd3 11.cxd3 is good for White.

11. 2d4! d6

After 11...@xb2 White plays 12.@xb5 axb5 13. axb2, with good play; but 11... 2e7, intending to possibly play ... 2c6, may be an option. 12 We2 e5

A quiet move like 12...@f6 would have been met strongly by 13.a4!. So Black must pull something out of his hat quickly, except that his position is not solid enough for this - his lag in development, and especially the exposed position of his king on e8, have fatal consequences.

13.@\d5! @xd5 14.exd5 @e7

Maybe Black should have played 14...f6. but who likes to play such a move?

15.fxe5 dxe5 15...@xe5 is met by the very awkward 16.a4!. 16. 2 xc4 exd4

Black's only option, otherwise he loses the pawn on c5. But now the storm really breaks over the black position.



17.d6! 資xc4 18.要f3 耳b8

Or 18... \$\bar{2}a7 19.\$\bar{2}ae1 & f6 20.dxe7. with a winning position. After 18... ad8 19.6 a5 We6 20.dxe7 @xe7 21. ae1 Wd5 22. @c6!, too. Black might as well resign. 19. ae1 € f6

Black has run out of useful moves. Moreover the threat 20.2a5 was looming again. 20. Exe7+ chf8 21. √a5 @c5

To meet 21... Wb4 the following forced winning line was found after the game: 22. #d5! 25.\(ef7+ \pie8 26.d7+ \pid8 27.\(\Oc6+ \pic7 \) 28.d8費++ \$xc6 29.耳f6+! 公xf6 (or 29...中c5 30.其c7+ 公xc7 31.實xc7+ 中d5 32. 當c6+, and mate) 30. 當c7+ 由d5 31. 其g5+. and mate on the next move.

22. Wb3 Wh5 23. Oc6 Ec8 24.d7 Ed8

25.Xe8+!

Black resigned in view of 25. @xe8 26 @xd8. ②f6 27. ©c6, or 25... Exc8 26. ₩b4+ \$\pmu_88 27.dxe8∰+ @xe8 28.@e7+, and mate.

SI 40.4

☐ Golubev

■ Podinic

Bucharest 2001

1.e4 c5 2.6 f3 e6 3.6 c3 6 c6 4.d4 cxd4 5. 0 xd4 \(\psi c7 \) 6. \(\pri e3 \) a6 7. \(\pri d3 \) 0 f6 8.0-0 Ø-65

Here 8...@xd4 9.@xd4 @c5 gives White the better position after 10.2xc5 \wxc5 11.2a4 ₩c7 12.c4, but 8...b5 is quite playable, as is 8...d6. which transposes to the Scheveningen. Black loses the present game, but I don't think this was caused by the text-move. 9.h3

Black was threatening 9...@eg4.

9....@c5 9...b5 is not bad either, e.g. 10.f4 @c4 11.@xc4

₩xc4 12.e5 @d5, with a roughly equal positi-

10.\$\dagger h1 d6 11.f4 @q6

12. ge1!?

Taking the d3 bishop is good for White: 11... axd3 12.cxd3, with good play. The knight move 11...@c6?! is regarded as less good in view of 12.e5!, the point being 12...dxe5 13.@db5! axb5 14.@xc5, with a winning advantage, But 11...@ed7 is probably quite playable.

The alternative is 12.\mathbb{e}f3, e.g. 12...0-0 13.\mathbb{E}ae1 b5 14.f5 @e5, with approximately equal chances. Hector-Pia Cramling, Malmö 1997

12...0-0 13.f5 @e5 14. Wh4 b5

In the previously played game Mitkov-Ru-

blevsky, Neum 2000, Black played 14...@d7. which was followed, as in the present game, by 15. If3!? @xf3 16.gxf3: 16... wh8? (stronger is 16... 響d8, e.g. 17. 直g1 ②e8! 18. 響h5 e5 19. ②d5

âxd4 20.âxd4 exd4 21.f6 ②xf6 22.②xf6+ ₩xf6 23.e5 ₩g6!, with an unclear position, Mitkoy) 17.星g1 ₩d8 18.e5! dxe5 19.届xg7! 星g8 20.届xg8+ ≙xg8 21. âg5, and White wins. 15.耳612

An interesting exchange sacrifice; the g-file is opened.

15...@xf3 16.qxf3



16...賞b6?

This loses by force. There are stronger possibilities. For a start there is 16... £h8?17.1 £g1 且g8 18 £x27 且xg7 19, ₩xf5 £d7 20.£h6 且g8, and in this unclear position the players abruptly agreed a draw, Averianov-Blinke, Polanica Zdroj 2001. The other possibility is 16... £c.8?17.7 £g1 g6 18. £g4 ∰57?7 (but not 18...b4?119.£cc2 ≤5? 20 ₩h6 d5 21. £g1 4 €cc2 €x6 £xc6 23.£xc5, Nedev-Comas, Batumi 1999) 19 ∰6, with unclear play.

17.≣g1! âxd4

Games played on the Internet are also part of the theory these days. The white player, for example, had won a blitz game against Naumann in the previous year after 17... €e8 18. ¤xg7+! €xg7 19.f6 wh8 20.7xg7+ фz8 21. ₩xh7+ xh7 22.xxf fwei 1-0.

18.e5! @xe3 19.Exg7+! @h8

After 19...\$xg7 White wins with 20.exf6+ \$\psi h8 21.fxe6.

20.Exh7+! @xh7 21.f6 Black resigned. SI 40.5

☐ Velimirovic ■ Vasiukov

Tbilisi 1973

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 ⊕c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 e6 5.⊕c3 a6 6.≙e2 ₩c7 7.0-0 b5

For 7... © f6, see the games Moizhess-Ivanov and Kuzmin-Sveshnikov. SI 40.6.

8.6 xc6 \wxc6?!

This is risky, as we will see. After 8...dxc6 9.f4
White has a slightly more pleasant position,
e.g. 9...âb7 10.☆h1 âc7 11.¥e1 b4 12.むb1
c5 13.むd2. Short-Leko, Groningen 1996.

9. 2f3 2b7 10. 2f4! d6

10... ⊑d8 is met very strongly by 11.a4! b4 12. ②d5!, while after 10... ⊑c8 11.e5 wc7 12. ②e4 White is also better.

11.**Ee1!** Threatening 12.a4 b4 13.⊕d5!.

Threatening 12.a4 b4 13.6 11...e5



12.a4!

This is an improvement on a game played earlier: 12. &d2?1 €/16 13.a4 bxa4 14. ∄xa4 &c7 15. &g5 0-0, with a roughly equal position, Geller-Taimanov, interzonal tournnament Palma de Mallorca 1970.

12...b4

After 12...exf4 13.e5 d5 (or 13...\\$b6 14.exd6+ \d8 15.axb5) 14.\(\infty\)xd5 0-0-0 15.axb5 \\$xb5 16.c4 營e8 17.營b3 White has a winning attack. Relatively best may be 12...bxa4, but after 13.基xa4 White is definitely better.

queen, which is rather a lot.

14...bxc3 is met by 15.Æc1! ₩d7 16.e5 dxe5 17.Æxc3 &xd5 18.£xd5 ¼d8 19.Æxd5 ½dx 19.Æxd5 ½dx 20.æc6 ₩xc5 21.₩xd8 ±xdx8 22.Æxc6 ⊕f6 23.Æxd6, and the endgame is very good for White, although Black may still be able to put up a fight. After the text he will be overrun in short order. 14...0-0-0 15.cxb4, incidentally, also gives White a winning attack.

15.e5 0-0-0

Or 15...dxe5 16.\(\bar{L}\)xe5+ \(\psi\)d8 17.\(\Q\)c7+ \(\bar{L}\)d7
18 \(\overline{L}\)xb7 and it's curtains

16. ₩xb3 \delta b8 17. \delta b4 \delta d7

07 17...₩06 18.42.60+. 18.42.xb7 \(\pi \xxb7 \) 19.\(\pi \delta \) 48 20.\(\pi \beta \) \(\pi \ar 21.\(\pi \xd7 \) Exd7 22.\(\pi \ad 1 \) Black resigned.

SI 40 6

☐ Hennings ■ Csulits

East Germany 1965

1.e4 c5 2.�f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.�xd4 ♠c6 5.♠c3 a6 6.♠e2 ∰c7 7.♠e3 ᡚf6 8.0-0 ♠b4 9.≝e1

The usual moves are 9.♠xc6 and 9.♠a4. The text is nice, but probably not really strong. 9...♠xc3?!

Black would have done better not to take the pawn. Good is 9...€e7!?, e.g. 10.∰d3 âxc3 11.bxc3 d5, with roughly equal play. 9...0-0 also comes into consideration.

10.bxc3 @xe4 11.âd3 @f6

11...@xc3 is met by 12.∰g4, while 12.c4 is a strong possibility after 11...d5.

12.4\f5!

Now the point of 9. I cl is revealed. The knight is invulnerable in view of 13. I cl 12. 0-0.



13.@xg7! @xg7 14.@h6+!

With these two beautiful sacrifices the black king is, as it were, sucked out of its hiding place.

. 14...⊈xh6

14...⊈g8 is hopeless as well in view of

15.₩d2+ **\$**h5

Retreating won't help either: 15...\$\pi 7.0\$\pi \pi 8.1\$\pi \pi 16.\$\pi \pi 15...\$\pi 7.10\$\pi \pi 8.1\$\pi 18.\$\pi 8.1\$\pi 18.\$\pi 8.1\$\pi 18.\$\pi 8.1\$\pi 18.\$\pi 8.1\$\pi 18.\$\pi 8.1\$\pi 18.\$\pi 8.1\$\pi 8.1

SI 40.6

☐ Kuzmin, Gennady

Sveshnikov

Moscow 1973

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 ⊘c6 5.⊕c3 ≝c7 6.≙e2 a6 7.0-0 ⊕f6 8.≙e3 ≙b4 9.⊕xc6

9. 0 a4 is the most common move these days. See, for instance, Moizhess-Ivanov.

148

9...bxc6

After 9...dxc6 White also plays 10. ②a4. Another option is 9... axc3 10.bxc3 ₩xc6. 10. ②a4 0-0 11.c4 ad6?!

11... ⊙xe4? is bad in view of 12.c5 ₩c5 13.âd4 ₩f4 14.âxg7 \$\pi\$xg7 15.\pi\$d4+, but 11...\pic1? is quite playable. The bishop turns

14...f5 15.\(\text{\text{\text{2}}}\) xe4 fxe4 16.\(\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{2}}}}}}\) d4 also favours

15 0d4 @d5?

This is beautifully refuted. After 15...g6 White would have kept Black in a stranglehold with 16.豐e2, followed by the manoeuvre 全a4-b6-c4. Maybe 15... 置d8 would have been Black's best option.



16.0 b6

White prepares the double bishop sacrifice. But this was unnecessary: 16.\(\text{\ti}\text{\texi\tinit\text{\tin\tinity}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\ti}\tinit{\

16...⊕xb6

After 16... \$\bar{\pma}\$ b8 the bishop sacrifices decide as well

17.业xh7+! \$\psixh7 18.\psih5+ \$\psig8 19.\partixxg7! \$\partixxg7 20.\psig4+ \$\psih7 21.\pif3 \partixxc5+ 22.\psih1

Black resigned.

SI 40.6

☐ Moizhess

Ivanov, Viktor

Moscow 1998

1.e4 c5 2. \bigcirc 13 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4. \bigcirc xd4 \bigcirc c6 5. \bigcirc c3 \bigcirc c7 6. \bigcirc c2 a6 7.0-0 \bigcirc 16 8 \bigcirc c9 \bigcirc c9 4 9. \bigcirc 04 9. \bigcirc 06

Taking the pawn is bad: 9...公xe4? 10.公xc6 營xc611.公b6草b812.營d4总f813.总f3. After the text Black does threaten to take on e4.

10.€xc6
Interesting is 10.c4; White calmly allows
Black to take the pawn: 10...€xc4 11.c5 0-0,
and both 12. Ec1 and 12.g3 yield White positional compensation for the pawn.

13.2d4 has also been played here. I have to refer you to the theory books or the databases.
13....od5 14.2c1

After 14. 2d4 the correct reply is 14...c5. 14...2c5 15.c4 €e7 16.b3 ∰c7 17.2b2 d612

Active counterplay! After 17...0-0 18.\(\hat{a}\)d3
White keeps a slightly better position.

18.exd6 axd6 19. d4
After 19.g3 Black plays 19...ae5, with an approximately equal position.

proxima

Black is more or less forcing White to take on g7. 19...2f5, although obvious, is less good: 20. ge4 &xh2+? 21. sh1 h5 22. fad1, with winning play for White, Matulovic-Portisch, Interzonal tournament. Sousse 1967.

20. ₩xg7 @xh2+ 21. \$\pi\$h1 \(\pi g8 22. \) #f6

Taking on h7 with 22.變xh7?! is probably too risky: 22... e5. 22.豐c3 包f5 also looks good for Black.

22... Ig6 23. Wh8+ &d7!?

Black wants to see whether there is more in it than move repetition via 23... 且g8.

24. 響xh7 息e5 25. 耳fd1+ 含c6 26. 急f3+

27 û ve5

Now it is another case of forced move repetition. Burgess has suggested the counter-sacrifice 7.1 Ed 7 № 47.72 . Δxc. 9, which is an intersigided. White may well have good prospects. 27... ₩xe5 28. ₩xf7 □R8+ 29. Φg1 □g7 30 □f64.4 €c7

SI 40.7

Renet

■ Taimanov Montpellier 1986

1.e4 c5 2.①f3 ②c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.②xd4 e6 5.①c3 a6 6.Ձe2 빻c7 7.0-0 ②f6 8.�bh1 합b4

A good alternative is 8...@xd4 9.\\xid4 \delta c5 10.\\xid3 b5.

9.@xc6 bxc6

With 9...₩xc6 Black can win at least a pawn,

although this is risky enough. 10.e.5 &x.s. 11b.xc3 wxs.1 2.exf w xxs.1 3.w6 wxf.6 14.&x3, with compensation for the sacrificed material, or 10.&x3 &xc3 (after 10.b.5 11.&x2 &xxs.1 2.ex yws.1 2.ex y

10.f4 0-0

Here, too, winning the pawn must be very risky for Black: 10...Ձxc3?! 11.bxc3 €xc4 12.₩d4 €16 13...Ձa3, but 10...d5 is a playable option. 11.e5 ②xc3!?

After 11...@e8?! White plays 12.@e4!. 12.bxc3 @d5



13.If3?!

13...c5 14.c4 ⊘e7 15.≣b1 ⊘f5 16.≗d3 ≗b7 17.≣h3 q6

Black has won the opening phase. White will succumb to the pressure along the b7-g2 diagonal. The white action on the kingside is of little consequence.

18.âd2 Iab8 19.Ib3 d5! 20.âxf5?!

20.exd6 e.p. wxd6 21.af1 would have been

stronger, Taimanov.

20...exf5 21.\(\mathbb{L}\)bg3 f6!

White was threatening 22.\(\mathbb{W}\)h5.

22.exf6 d4! The rest is easy

23. Ib3 Ixf6 24. Ib1 Ie6 25. Ihg3 Ie2 26. Ib1 Ibe8 27. h3 Ib6 28. Ibf3 Ib6 29. Ib3 2c6 30. Ib1 Ixc4

White resigned.

SI 41.9

☐ Mazi
■ Pavasovic

Bled 2000

1.e4 c5 2.⊕13 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 a6 5.⊕c3 b5 6.âd3 ₩b6 7.âe3 âc5 8.₩g4!?

In NIC Yearbook 57 this move was called the novelty of the year. Up to that time, 8.2e2 had always been regarded as the only move here.

8. 0 xrd4



9.e5! @xe3

The safest reaction is 9... 0.c61?; after 10. wxg7 2xe5 11. wxc5 0.xc5 12. 2xb6 0.xd3+13.cxd3 White is at most marginally better. 10. wxg7 2xf2+11. df1 2h4

After 11... ②c6 12. ₩xh8 &f8 (after 12... ②c7, 13. ②e4 is strong) 13. &xh7 ₩e3 14. ₩xg8+

\$e7 15.@e4 âb7 16.₩g5+ ₩xg5 17.@xg5 âd4 18.c3 âxe5 19.âc2 White eventually remains the exchange up, according to an analysis by Gallagher.

12.q3 âb7

13. Wxh8

13.盖g1 is also worth considering, Gallagher. 13....皇xh1 14.蒙xg8+ 会e7 15.gxh4

15.變g4!, as played in the premiere of 8.變g4!, Gallagher-Milov, Biel 2000, is stronger. After 15... 並格 16.變xh4+如c7 White would have remained better after 17.且e!! 公c6 18.變xh7. 15. 變名 16 且e1

An alternative was 16. ₩g5+!?, Gallagher. 16...₩f4+ 17. ☆q1 &f3 18. Дe4?!

An amusing move, but according to Gallagher, 18. #g5+ would still be stronger, and White is slightly better. Now it will be a draw. 18...\$\times xe4 19.\$\times xe4

18... 2 xe4 19. 2 xe4 The point.

19...b4 And the reply.

20.全xa8 bxc3 21.豐xb8 豐d4+ After 21...豐c1+ 22.全g2 cxb2 23.豐d6+全e8

After 21... wc1+22. sg2 cxb2 23. wd6+ sce 24. \$b8+ White has perpetual check. 22. \$c92 \$\forall d2+ 23.\$\pi\$ h3 \$\forall e3+ 24.\$\pi\$ g2 \$\forall e2+ 25.\$\pi\$ g3 \$\forall e1+\$

Now Black has perpetual check. 26.

26.

292

292

292

292

293

294

295

295

295

296

297

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

298

SI 41.15

☐ Berczy
■ Neishtadt

Correspondence game 1959

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 a6 5.c4 @f6 6.@c3 @b4 7.e5

An interesting move, but if Black plays it right, it will yield White precious little.

Another idea is 7... \(\pi a 5?!\), but this is quite dubious in view of 8.exfef \(\preceq 1.8x = 3 + 9.bx \) \(\pi \) \

Now 8.. ₩85? is just bad. See the later correspondence game Skotorenko-Belomestnikh from 1967: 9.₩xg² Δxc3+ 10.bxc3 ₩xc3+ 11.4xc2 ₩xa1 12.₩xh8+ 4xc7 13.Δa3+ d6 14.Δxd6+ 4xd7 (after 14...€xd6, 15.%xc6+ wins: 15...£xc6 16.xxd6+, winning the queen, or 15...&xd7 16.wd8+, and made) 15.%xc6 (a perfect bull's eye!) 15...&xd6 (or 15...&xxc6 16.wdx6+, or 15...&xd2 16.xd2 ₩xf2+ 17.4xxd4, and Black has no perpetual) 16.wd8+ ±xxd6 17.₩xd6+ 4xf5 18.₩f6+ 4xc4 17.₩xd6+ 4xf5 18.₩f6+ 4xd6 10.bxc3



10...≝a5

Very good would be 10...d6!? at once, e.g. 11.exd6 e5 12.⊕f5 g6 13.∰g3 ⊕c6 14.⊕h6 wxd6 15.2e2 f5 16.2e5 2e7 17.0-0 2xg5 18 wxg5 we7, with good play for Black, Van der Wiel-Cacho Reigadas, zonal tournament Linares 1995.

This eventually leads to a draw through perpetual check more or less by force. Less good is 14.¢d1? wxal 15.2d3 ±d7 16.4c2 2€6 17.€xx6 (or 17.2c3 wx31) 17..±xx6 18.±5 wb24 19.4d1 ±da4+ 20.\$c1 f5 21.₩x6+ ±df8, and White has no good way to continue his attack and can't even claim perpetual check. 14...₩x41+ 15.5c62

Now White is threatening 16. àb4.
15...₩b2 16. фe3 \(\triangle \)c6 17. \(\triangle \)xc6 \(\triangle \)b6+
18. ₩d4 \(\triangle \)xc7 \(\triangle \)c5+

Bad is 19...\(\frac{1}{2}\) fir view of 20.\(\frac{1}{2}\) b4. After the text White cannot prevent perpetual check. 20.\(\frac{1}{2}\) e2 \(\frac{1}{2}\) e3.\(\frac{1}{2}\) e4 \(\frac{1}{2}\) e2 \(\frac{1}{2}\) e3.\(\frac{1}{2}\) e4 \(\frac{1}{2}\) e3.\(\frac{1}{2}\) e3.\(\frac{1}{2}\) e3.\(\frac{1}{2}\) e3.\(\frac{1}{2}\) e3.\(\frac{1}{2}\) e3.\(\frac{1}{2}\) e4.\(\frac{1}{2}\) e4.\(\frac{1}{2}\) e3.\(\frac{1}{2}\) e4.\(\frac{1}{2}\) e4.\(\frac{1}{2}\) e4.\(\frac{1}{2}\) e4.\(\frac{1}{2}\) e5.\(\f

SI 41.15

☐ Karadzic
■ Honfi

Baimok 1975

1.e4 c5 2. \odot f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4. \odot xd4 a6 5.c4 \odot f6 6. \odot c3 \pm b4 7. \pm d3 \odot c6 8. \odot xc6 dxc6 9.e5 \oplus a5

This move leads to difficult complications in which Black, in particular, has to be careful, even though the line is not downright bad for Black. After the safe 9...€u7 10.f4 €c5 11.ac2 8w.ad1+1.2.æxd1 white is slightly better. Also interesting is 9...€u4 10.8w.g4 (Sosonko's suggestion of 10.ad41? may be stronger) 10...®xd311.8w.xg7 In 8. and Black has counterflash.

10.exf6 ≜xc3+ 11.bxc3 ₩xc3+



12.û.d2

The exchange sacrifice 12. #d2?! is dubious; after 12.. #xa1 neither 13.fxg7 #xg7 14.0-0 e5 15.f4 _2g4, nor 13.0-0 #xf6 14._\(\text{Lb2}\) #e7 15.\(\text{kap2}\) f (is particularly convincing. 12.. #yd3 13.fxq7 #d8

The intermediate 13... 響e4+ is worse: 14.並行 置g8 15.並g5! 響xc4+16.並g1 響d5 17.並f6 e5 18.響c2 並e6 19.響xh7, with advantage for White. Khasin-Sergievsky Kiev 1965

14.Ձh6

Or 14.2g5 **c3+ 15.4cf1 2d7!? 16.4b1 **gxg7 17.4xb7 f6 18.2xf6! **gxg2+ 19.4ce2 **ge4+ 20.4cd2 c5 21.4cf1 **ge6 22.4cf1 **ge6 22

14...\#c3+ 15.\pt1



15... 對xc4+?!

Taking a pawn with check – obvious enough, one would say. But 15... ₩f6! is probably a better idea. See the game Drygalski-Filutowski. 16.☆q1 ₩h4

The queen turns out to be slightly offside here. But it is doubtful whether 16... \$\vec{\pm}\$d5 is better: 17.\vec{\pm}\$e1 !? \(\text{\$\pm}\$d7 18.\vec{\pm}\$d1 \) \$\vec{\pm}\$f5 19.\text{\$\pm}\$d 0-0-0 20.\vec{\pm}\$h3 e5 21.\vec{\pm}\$dh3, and White had a winning attack, Torre-Tan Lian Ann, Interzo-

nal tournament, Manila 1976.

More stubborn is 18...\$\pi7??. The idea is to more or less get to safety with \$\mathbb{L} = 8\$ and \$\pi g 8\$.

19.h3 \$\pi7?

Now this move is no longer good. Correct was 19...a5 in order to prevent White's next. 20. \(\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{

21...\dagger h4 is also hopeless: 22.g5 \dagger h5 23.\dagger d6 fxg5 24.\dagger f8+.

22. Exb7+! \$\psie6 23.f4! f5 24. Ec7
Black resigned

SI 41.15

☐ Drygalski ■ Filutowski

Correspondence game 1995

For 15... wxc4+?!, see the game Karadzic-Honfi. The text should be stronger.

16. xc1 e5 17. xb1 & e6!?

 teresting continuation 18 cxb5 axb5 19 ±Bc2 ±bf5 20.h4 ±Ba4 21.±gd1 ±gd 22.±d2 ±cd 23.₩a3 ₩abf6 24.₩a84 ±c7 25.₩a74 ±bf6 26.±dbc4 ±xxg7 27.±xh6 ±xh6 28.₩e34 ±bf5 29.f3 ±xg2+ 30.¢d1 ±dd5 31.₩xe5+ ±bf6 32.₩f4+ ±bf5 33.₩f5+ ±bf6, draw, Lonoff-S.Wolff, correspondence game 1990. 18.±xb7 0-0-19.±bf81



This is far stronger than 19.\(\mathbb{L}\)a7?! from the game Poulsen-Farago, Svendborg 1981 that is mentioned in some of the theory books: 19..\(\mathbb{W}\)h4! 20.\(\mathbb{L}\)a8+? \(\phi\)c7 21.\(\mathbb{L}\)xd8 \(\mathbb{L}\)xd8 \(\mathbb{L}

Another idea is 19....åh3, when 20. Exa6? is bad in view of 20... @f31, and 20.gxh3 @f3 21.Egt Ealt-12.2 @xd1 @wd1+23.2 @g2 @d6 24.Egb1 @g6+25.dr1 @d3+results in perpetual check. But with 20. Eb31? White can keep the fight going — be may have the better chances, although things are anything but clear of course.

20.Exc6+ &b7 21.Ec5 ₩d8

After 21... ■gd8?! White plays 22. ★e1!, with advantage, not 22. ★e2?! in view of 22... ₩h4. 22. ★e2

But now 22...₩d6? is not good: 23.₩b2+ \$\psi_a8 24.\textbf{\textbf{Z}}b1.

23.₩a3

23.\(\beta\)xe5 is met by 23...\(\hat{a}\)xc4+24.\(\beta\)e1 \(\beta\)b4+
25.\(\hat{a}\)d2 \(\beta\)xd2 \(\beta\)d2 \(\beta\)d2 \(\beta\)th, with perpetual check.

23... \(\hat{\text{\pi}} \) xc4 + 24.\(\hat{\pi} \) xc4 = \(\hat{\pi} \) xc4 = 25.\(\hat{\pi} \) 13+ \(\hat{\pi} \) bb 8 = 26.\(\hat{\pi} \) xf7 = \(\hat{\pi} \) 22+ 27.\(\hat{\pi} \) 28.\(\hat{\pi} \) 28.\(\hat{\pi} \) 29.\(\hat{\pi} \) e2 \(\hat{\pi} \) b5+ 30.\(\hat{\pi} \) 30.\(\

Draw.

SI 41.20

■ Janosevie

Sarajevo 1966 1.e4 c5 2.⊕13 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 a6 5.⊕c3 ₩c7 6.⊛e2.⊕16 7 t412

Interesting, albeit not entirely convincing. Normal is 7.0-0 \(\Delta b \)4 8 \(\mathbb{\overline{\overl



8.e5!? @xc3+

8...&e4!? is probably better. In Jansa-ECastro, Lugano Olympiad 1968, there followed 9.0-0 20x3 10.bxc3 12xc3. After 11...&b3 12xc1 12...&b2 2...&c6 13.15 2...&c7!? 14...&c6 2xf6 15...&xf6 2xf6 15...&xf6 2xf8 16...&xf5 White had some pressure for his pawn, but his compensation was not overly clear.

9.bxc3 \widetilde{w}xc3+ 10.\widetilde{w}d2 \widetilde{w}xa1

11.exf6 @c6

After 11...gxf6 12.0-0 White also had good prospects.

After 15... wg6 16.f5 wxg7 17.2f3 d5 18.2a3 White has great play for the exchange.

16.f5 we4 17. #f2!

More obvious is 17.≜f3?!, but this move is less convincing: 17...\@fsf3 !8.\@st5^ \@sf1 \@sf1...\@fsf3 !7 \@fsf1 \@sf1 \@sf1

22...響xe3 23.響xf6+ or 22...響al+ 23.盒fl won't save Black either.

23. ± b6! ± d7 24. # d8+ ± c6 25. # c7+

Mate.

SI 42.2

☐ Anand ■ Ninov

Baguio City 1987

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 a6 5.Ձd3 Ձc5 6.⊕b3 Ձa7 7.⊕c3 ⊕c6 8.₩e2 d6 9.Ձe3 Ձxe3 10.₩xe3 ⊕f6 11.g4!?

White launches an immediate attack. Anand found this move, then a novelty, over the board.

11...b5

After II... ©xg4 12. **g3 ©f6 13. **gxg7 \(\frac{1}{8}\)gen 41. **g16 White will be slightly better and Black will have to aim for castling queenside with \(\frac{1}{8}\)d7 and **gc7 . An interesting idea is II...\(\frac{1}{8}\)11. **gxg5 \(\frac{1}{9}\)gen 41.3 **gg32! **yg5 \(\frac{1}{8}\)4.13 ** @gc5 15. **gxg5 \(\frac{1}{9}\)4.13 ** Black would

have won a pawn, Geenen-Blees, Brussels zonal tournament 1993.

12.0-0-0 0-0 13.g5 @e8

Another possibility was 15. a4 to prevent the black advance a6-a5-a4. But as Anand wrote in his notes to the game, he preferred to go for an attack.

15...a5 16. 0bd4 0xd4 17. 0xd4 wb6

After the game 17....44 was suggested as an improvement, but in his book My Best Games of Chess Anand then indicates the variation 18.\(\tilde{Dec}\) 6 \(\tilde{w}\)c7 19.\(\tilde{Dec}\)xb4 a3 20.b3 \(\tilde{w}\)c3 21.\(\tilde{w}\)e1 19.\(\tilde{V}\)th b4 a3 20.b3 \(\tilde{W}\)c3 11.\(\tilde{w}\)e1 19.\(\tilde{V}\)e1 19.\(\tilde

18.e5! &b7 19.Ehf1 dxe5

19...a4 is followed by 20.15! dxe5 (20...exf5 is met very strongly by 21.e6) 21.fxe6 exd4 22.₩h3 g6 (22...f5 23.ℤxf5 gives White a winning attack) 23.εxf7+ ℤxf7 24.ℤxf7 ±xf7 25.₩xh7+, and Black loses his queen. After 19...ℤd8 White's reply 20.151 is also strong. Thus Anand.

20.fxe5 \(\bar{\pi}\)d8?

Too careless... Now White has an effective combination. The only move was 20...g6, after which White continues 21.⊕f5 wxe3+22.⊕xe3, and he has a positional advantage.



21.≙xh7+! ±xh7 22.g6+ ±g8 Or 22...±xg6 23.≝d3+ f5 24.exf6+ e.p. 23.≝h3 €1f6

Or 23...fxg6 24.≣xf8+ \$xf8 25.@xe6+.

24.exf6 fxq6 25.fxq7

Black resigned in view of 25...如xg7 26.④xe6+ 如g8 27.置xf8+ 显xf8 28.④xf8 如xf8 29 樂h8+.

SI 42.2

☐ Kengis

■ Nevednichy

Moscow 1979

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 a6 5.ଛd3 ଛc5 6.⊕b3 ଛa7 7.₩e2 ⊕c6 8 ≋e3 ≋xe3

After 8...@f6 9.@c3 d6 10.0-0-0 &xe3+ the same position as in the game arises, but Black can also try 8... @ge7. Nunn and Gallagher, in their Beating the Sicilian 3, have this to say about it: "Against this plan we are recommending that White castle short, not getting involved in the habitual pawn storming comnetition as his attack won't have as much momentum without a knight on f6 for the g-pawn to sink its teeth into". This sounds plausible enough. An example is Kindermann-Zso.Polgar, Münster 1994; 9. 2c3 #c7 10.f4 d6 11.4.xa7 Exa7 12.0-0 b5 13.Eae1 b4 14.6 d1 0-0 15.2 e3 d5 16.e5 f5 17.exf6 e.p. axf6 18. Wh5 g6 19. Wg5, with a positional advantage for White.

9.營xe3 心f6 10.心c3 d6 11.0-0-0 0-0 12.f4 營c7 13.g4!

White goes on the offensive!

13...b5

Taking the pawn looks very dangerous: 13...公xg4 14.雙g3 ②f6 15.置hg1 ②e8 16.f5 or 16.饗h4, and White should have good compensation for his pawn.

Attacking e6, and already keeping an eye on h7 (and h6!).

17...exf5 18.exf5 ⊘de5 19.⊘f4 a4 20.⊘d5 ∰d8 21.⊑hq1



21...@xd3+?

This is the crucial point of the game. The text robs White of the potentially dangerous bishop but it does activate the white rook. After 21_axb3 White would have been up against stiffer resistance. The following variation comes from Nunn and Gallagher's book: 22_axp6 ± ar 26_axf6 hxg6 23_4xx6 fxg6 23_axg6 ± ar 26_axf6 hxg6 27_axg6 ± ar 26_axf6 hxg6 27_axg6 ± ar 26_axf6 hxg6 27_axg6 ± ar 26_axf6 hxg6 23_axg6 ± ar 26_axf6 hxg6 23_axg6 ± ar 26_axg6 ± ar 26_

22. Exd3 ⊕e5 23. ⊕f6+! gxf6 24. ₩h6! After 24. gxf6+? ⊕g6 White has nothing. 24...⊕xd3+

Now 24... £26 loses in view of 25. £h3 £e8 26.fxg6 fxg6 27. ₩xh7+ \$\psi 18 28. ₩h8+, and 24... \$\psi h8 fails to 25. £h3 £xf5 26.g6!. 25. \$\psi h1!

After 25.cxd3? wh8 the white attack falters. 25...fxg5

His only hope, After 25... \$\alpha\$18 White would have played 26.g6! fxg6 27.fxg6, and he is winning.

26.f6 ₩xf6 27.₩xf6

Black resigned.

SI 42 2

☐ Zuidema
■ Ivkov

Beigrade 1964

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 a6 5.⊕d3 ⊕c5 6.⊕b3 ⊕a7 7.0-0 ⊕c6 8.⊕b12!

White wants to play f4, but 8. we2, followed by £e3, is a better idea, as it is important to eliminate £a7. See the games Anand-Ninov and Kengis-Nevednichy.

8...@f6 9.f4 h5!

With the white king on h1, a lightning attack is on the cards.

10 a42

A costly waste of time! The correct move is 10.0c3, when after 10...0g4 11.實行 響台 12.h3 g5 White has the saving 13.0d1. 10...0g4 11.實行 響內 12.h3



12...g5! 13.ûd2

The point of Black's previous move is 13,fxg5 ⊕f2+ 14,⊕fh2 ⊕e5, followed by 15...⊕eg4+. After the text the black g-pawn penetrates further into the white position. White's position is hopeless

13... ♠ 12+ 14. ★ h2 g4 15. ★ g3 ★ xg3+ White resigned, as he is facing the forced continuation 16. ★ xg3 h4+ 17. ★ h2 g3+ 18. ★ g1 ♠ xd3+.

SI 42.3

☐ Matulovic ■ Hamann

Kislovodsk 1966

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 a6 5.@d3 @c6 6.@xc6 bxc6

After 6...dxc6 White has the slightly more pleasant play, e.g. 7. âc3 c5 8. ②d2 âcd 9.a4 ②f6 10. ②c4, Ghinda-Popov, Luzern Olympiad 1982.

7.0-0 d5

Black has a majority in the centre, but you couldn't say for sure that this is an advantage

Swapping on e4 is almost never a good idea here, as this turns the c6 pawn into a weak isolated pawn. Besides, Black's slight lag in development also causes him problems.

8.₩e2
Another good move is 8.e4. In Fischer-Petrosian, 7th match game Buenos Aires 1971, there followed 8...£f6 9.cxd5 cxd5 10.exd5 exd5?! 11.₺e3 &e7 12.₩a4+ ₩d7?! after 12...&d7 White plays 13.₩e2 or 13.₩d4) 13.ℤe1 ₩xa4 14.₺xa4 &e6 15.&e3, with a positional advantage for White

8...2f6 9.2g5 2e7 10.2d2 0-0 11.Zae1 Ze8 12.2h1 2b7 13.f4 c5?

This is refuted. Correct was 13... £d7, quickly followed by ... £f8.

14.e5 @d7 15.@xh7+! @xh7 16.\h5+ @g8 17.\square

17...fs is not enough either: 18.£h3, and now 18...fs 19.£u3 Eato 20.£xf6 £xf6 £2.£e5 for 18...£u8 19.£u5 ¥c7 20.exf6 £xf6 £2.£e5 wc7 20.exf6 £xf6 £1.\\$\text{w}f8 + \text{w}f7 22.\\$\text{e}c5 + \text{w}c7 23.\\$\text{w}g7 +. The decisive intervention always comes from the d2 knight.

The fact that Black cannot take on g5 (as this opens the f-file) plays an important part in these lines.

18.≣h3 @f8 19.@f3

Black resigned.

SI 42.14

□ Stein, Leonid

■ Portisch

Saltsiöbaden 1962

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 a6 5.≜d3 ⊕f6 6.0-0 ⊯c7 7.⊕d2 ⊕c6 8.⊕xc6 bxc6 9.f4 ⊕c5+2!

Stein has called this move an imaginary gain of tempo. Simply 9...&e7 is better. 9...d5 10.e5 \(\frac{1}{2} \)d7 11.c3 \(\frac{1}{2} \)c5 12.\(\frac{1}{2} \)c2 \(\frac{2}{2} \)d2 has also been recommended, but instead of 10.e5 White has a stronger option in 10.\(\frac{3}{2} \)e2 (2.1)

10. drh1 d6 11. Øf3 e5 Black is virtually forced to play this, because White would otherwise play 12.e5. e.g.

11...0-0? 12.e5 dxe5 13.fxe5 \(\)d5 14.\(\)xh7+!.

12.fxe5 dxe5 13.\(\)\(\)h4 0-0 14.\(\)\(\)f5 \(\)\(\)e6

Taking the knight won't solve Black's problems either: \(14...\(\)\(\)xf5 \(\) 15.\(\)\(\)xf5 \(\)\(\)\(\)\(\)

blems either: 14...≜xf5 15.\pixf5 \@e8 16.\gammag4, and White has good attacking chances.

15.₩e2 a5 16.ŵc4 wh8 17.ŵg5 @d??! According to Stein, Black should have played 17...ŵg8 here. This leaves him with a passive position, but he may be able to defend. 18.Ⅲad1 @b6?

This is refuted in surprising fashion. After

18... £xf5 19. Exf5 @b6 Black is worse, but he can still fight.



19. 2xg7! 2xc4

The beautiful point of the sacrifice.

20... 2e7
After 20... 2xe2 Black is mated in two moves:

21. 2f5+ \$\psi g8 22. 2\h6, while 20... 2d7 is met by 21. \(\mathbb{L}xd7\).

21.₩f3

Black resigned, as after 21...\$g8 the decisive 22. \lozenge h5 wins.

158

Four Knights and Pin Variation

Black plays 2...e6 and 4... 16

SI 34.2

□ Nunn ■ Kouatly

Cannes 1992

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 @c6 6.@e2

6. 4b5 or 6. 4xc6 is more common in this Four Knights variation.

6....ab4 7.0-0!?

The aim of the previous move, a pawn sacrifice.

The offical theory has grave doubts about this idea, but White will certainly get chances.

7...≜xc3 8.bxc3 €xe4 9...d3



9...d5

Taking the second pawn with 9... ②xc3 looks very risky, yet Black could possibly get away with it: 10.實 4 0-0 11. ②xc6 dxc6 12. 业 b2 (or 12. 业 b6 實 6 13. 业 g5 實 6 14. 国 ae1 f5

15.賞c4 包e4, with unclear play) 12...e5! 13.皇xh7+ \$\psixh7\$ 14.\begin{array}{c} 14.\begin{array}{c} 4.\begin{array}{c} 6.\begin{array}{c} 6.\begin

10.2 a3 was 11. wc1 4 xd4

After 11... \(\Omega\)xc3 12.\(\Omega\)b3 \(\omega\)c7 13.\(\omega\)c3 f6 14.\(\omega\)act act \(\omega\)c7 15.\(\omega\)c5 White has a strong initiative for his two pawns, Bielczyk-Tisdall, Gaustal 1983

12.cxd4 b6

13.c4!? is also possible, when 13... £a6? is impossible in view of 14.cxd5.



13.... a6?!

Black should have tried to force a draw through repetition with 13... #d2! 14. #b2 #c3, for now things are going to go badly wrong for him.

14. Ie1! 0-0-0

16.全xe4 dxe4 17.豐g5 also loses. 15.全b4 豐a4 16.c4 查b7 17.全c2 豐c6 After 17..豐xa2? 18.cxd5 exd5 19.亞xe4! dxe4 20.全xe4+ White has a winning attack.

18.c5 bxc5?
Black should at the very least have kept the

position closed with 18 ...b5, even though White is very good after 19. #a3.

19. a5+ ac8? 19. a8 was relatively Black's best choice. 20. a3! cxd4 21. axe4

Black resigned.

□ Baer

■ Engelhardt

Correspondence game 1992

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 e6 6.@db5 d6

The traditional continuation is 6...&b4, but these days almost everyone plays 6...d6 in order to transpose to the Sveshnikov after 7.&f4 e5. Because the bishop is hanging, you'd say that White has no other choice besides 8.&g5, but this is not the case

7. £f4 e5 8. Ød5!? A speculative idea.

8...@xd5

....@Xd5

8...exf4 9.\Dbc7+\Ddc710.\Dxa8 \Dxd5 11.exd5 \Dec 19 leads to a position that is hard to assess. 9.exd5 exf4

After 9... ⊕e7 White can play 10. ≜xe5!? dxe5 11.d6, with unclear complications. For 9... ⊕b8, see the game Kuznetsov-Kozirev. 10.dxc6 bxc6 11. ¥f3 d5

Other moves here are 11... 數b6!? and 11... 单b7!?.

12.0-0-0 Ae7

Bad is 12...cxb5? in view of 13.\overline{\textbf{Z}}xd5 \overline{\textbf{\textit{a}}}d7 14.\overline{\textbf{\textbf{L}}}xb5, but 12...\overline{\textbf{L}}d7 is worth looking at. A possible continuation is 13.\(\pi\x\)f4 cxb5 14.\(\pi\x\)d5 a6 15.\(\pi\cdot\)c4!? bxc4 16.\(\pi\hat\)d1, with very unclear play; Black is two pieces up, but he is badly caught.

13. Wc3!



13...cxb5?!

Now Black will find himself in serious trouble. Stronger is 13...0-0!? 14. $\$ xc6 $\$ xc6 15. $\$ cc7 $\$ Lc8 16. $\$ xc6 $\$ xc6 17. $\$ xc8 $\$ xd8 18. $\$ xc2, and the endgame is slightly better for White. 14. $\$ xc7 $\$ xc6

14... \$\pi f 8\$ is met by 15. \$\partial x b 5 + \$\partial d 7\$ 16. \$\pi x d 5\$. \$\partial x b 5 + \$\partial d 7\$ 16. \$\pi x d 5\$.

White's strongest option. Less clear is 15. Ee1+ 並付7 16. 實 x77+ 並c6, and the black king finds a safe bothlole on the queenside. 15. 並e7 16. Ehe1+ 並e6 17. 三xe6+! 並xe6 18. Ee1+ 並d6 19. 圖文17 並c5 Or 19. ... IR 20 三在6+ 並c5 21. 屬b7?。 with

strong threats.

20.≣e6 ≗e7

After 20...\$\pix\$\text{tb}\$ the white player has indicated the following winning line: 21.\$\pi\$\text{tb}\$T\$ \\
\pi\text{b}\$ 2.2.\$\pi\text{tb}\$ \\
\pi\text{b}\$ 2.3.\$\pi\text{c}\$ + \text{ax6} 2.3.\$\pi\text{c}\$ + \text{ax6} (or 23...\$\pi\text{tb}\$ 7.4.\$\pi\text{tb}\$ + \text{axb6} 2.3.\$\pi\text{tf}\$ + \text{ta}\$ 2.7.\$\pi\text{tb}\$ + \text{ta}\$ 2.8.\$\pi\text{tb}\$ = \text{2.3.}\pi\text{tb}\$ + \text{2.3.}\pi\text{tb}\$ = \text{2.3.}\pi\text{tb}\$ = \text{2.3.}\pi\text{tb}\$

Or 23...\$xb5 24.\$xd5+.

Or 24...≌ab8 25.⊯xd5.

25 We1+ \$23 26 Wd2 IIfb8 27 IIxb7 And Black resigned. White plays 28. \$\mu\$h3+.

SI 34 4

☐ Kuznetsov ■ Kozirev

Cheliabinsk 1993

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 e6 6.@db5 d6 7.@f4 e5 8 @d5!? @xd5 9.exd5 @b8 This is a solid defence, but White won't give

up and continues on his merry sacrificing way. 10. @ xe5!?

The quiet 10.2e3 is also playable. 10...dxe5

The intermediate move 10, .a67 is bad in view of 11 @e21

With 11...@xd6 12.\@xd6 \@xd6 13.@xd6+ de7 Black can return the piece, but then the endeame after 14.0xc8+ #xc8 15.@d3 is slightly better for White Unclear is 11... 2c6

12 Ø c7+ \$\d7 13 Ø xa8 @ xd6 14 @ c4 12 wd5 wb6

11 d6 @a6

The game Kuznetsov-Golakov, Russia 1992, saw 12...ae6 13. @xb7 @c8 14. @xa6 @xa6 15 Øc7+ \$d7 16.@xa6 &xd6 17.&b5+ \$e7 18.0-0-0, with advantage for White. After 12... #f6 13.0-0-0 White should have compensation for the sacrificed piece.

13. ₩xe5+ êe6 14.d7+

After 14.0-0-0? 0-0-0 Black has weathered the worst of the storm

14...\$xd7 15.0-0-0+ \$c8

15 \$\psi_e 8\$ is followed by 16 \$\partial c 4 \pi c 8 17. \pi d6! @xd6 18 @xd6+ \$e7 19 @f5+ with advantage for White.

16.¤d6!? According to the white player, 16.2c4!? 2c5

17. \$\mathbb{I}\$ d6!? is also possible. The position is extremely complicated,

16...\c

Or 16... axd6 17. axd6+ ab8 18. axf7+ @c7

19 響xe6 耳c8 20.c3, with unclear play. 17. □xe6 fxe6 18. ₩xe6+ ŵb8

Certainly not 18... \$\d8? 19.\hat{e}2.

19 We8+ Wc8 20 We5+ Oc7 21 Oxc7 wxc7 22 we8+ wc8 23 we5+ wc7

Black resigns himself to a draw. He could have continued the fight with 23... ad6!? 24. 實xd6+ 實c7, although the endgame after 25 @xe7+ @xe7 26. @d3 h6 would offer approximately equal chances. And a draw was agreed.

SI 34 4

☐ Xu Vuhua

■ Cramling

Shenyang 2000

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 @f6 5.@c3 @c6 6.@db5 @c5!?

An early deviation that is especially popular in Sweden, where Rolf Martens has dubbed it the Cohra

7. £f4

White immediately draws a bead on square d6. The attempt to secure square d6 by means of 7 @e32! @xe3 8.@d6+ de7 9.fxe3 failed after 9 Wc7 in Wells-Hall German Bundesliga 1999/00. After 10.@cb5 Black does not play 10. Wb82 11 e5 のxe5 12 Wd4 のc6 13 Wc5 h6 14. ₩a3, and White wins, but 10... ₩b6 11 \dd d2 a6, and the white pieces are rebuffed. After 7.4 d6+ \$e7 8.2f4 Black has a choice between 8... ₩b6 (9. 0c4 @xf2+ 10. de2 ₩d4 vields White little) and 8 e5.9 € f5+ \$f8.

7...0-0

This is part and parcel of Black's plan. 7 ..e5?! 8.âe3 âxe3 9.@d6+ \$f8 10.fxe3 is dangerous now, because not only d6 but now also d5 has been irreparably weakened. This was horne out in Groszneter-Orso. Berlin 1996: 10 @e8 11@xe8 \$xe8 12.@c4 響h4+ 13.g3 響h6 14.0-0.

8.e5

The youthful Chinese prodigy tackles things

energetically. Occupying d6 at once causes Black no problems: 8.2d6 Wh6! 9.2xc5 (9. axf8? axf2+ 10. ad2 we3 mate!) 9. 響xc5 10 響d6 響b6 11 響c7 響c5 12 響d6 ₩b6 ½-½ Borriss-Hall, German Bundesliga 1999/00

People were aware as early as the '60s that the best reply to 8.2c7 #e7 9.2d6 2xd6 10. 響xd6 is to be found in 10. 公e8! 11 響ye7 @xe7 12 0-0-0 f5 Tringov-Bilek Amsterdam 1964. White is only marginally better. 8...Øe8

Black can also go for 8...a6 9.0d6 @e8 10.@ce4 @xd6 11.exd6 @a7 12 ₩d2 b5 13. £d3 f5, as in Roser-Janssen, Glorney Cup. Glenalmond 1996 9. Pe4 9 e7 10. 9 d3

A better way to maintain the pressure is 10.c3 f6 (or 10...a6 11.@bd6 f6 12.exf6 @xf6 13.@xf6+ @xf6 14.@g3±) 11.exf6 @xf6 12.@d6. 10...a6

10...f6 11.exf6 âxf6 is a lot simpler. 11.Wh52!

A speculative sortie inspired by the fact that Black is comfortable after 11.6/bd6 Wa5+ 12. afl @xe5 13. ah5 f5 14. @xe8 g6! or 11. 公bc3 響c7 12. 響h5 g6 13. 響h6 公xe5, 11...a6

I don't see anything wrong with 11...axb5 15 Wh6 Wyf6

12. wh6 axb5 13.h4 f5! 14.h5 q5

The simplest road to an advantage was 16 Wc712 17 f4 @xe5 18 fye5 Wye5+ 19.dd2 響xb2 20.ee3 單a4. 17. ad2 b4 18.f4 重f7?!

18... 對d5! 19.直g1 直f7 20.g4 亘g7 ingeniously combines attack and defence.

19.g4 @e7 20.Eg1 Eg7 21. ee2 eh8? Due to time-trouble, the Swedish grandmaster overlooks 21...fxg4! 22. Exg4 Exg4 23. 資xh7+ 由f8. After 24.2g6 ₩b5+ 25.由f3 Ixg6 26.hxg6 管d5+ 27.含e2 管e4+ Black wins.

22.gxf5 @xf5?

Although Black's defensive line looks solid enough, White's reply quickly disabuses her of this notion, 22...@g8 23. \$\pixe7 @xh6 24.\$\pie7 ₩d825.f6 € f526. êxb4 was ber final chance



23.Xxq7!!

This is the queen sacrifice Xu Yuhua had been aiming for.

23...@xh6 After 23...@exg7 24.\frac{1}{2}f6 the black cavalry is reduced to watching passively as their king is

24. Ixh7+ was 25. Ia1+ wfs 26. Ixh6 ©e7 27.≅h8! d6 28.h6 @d7

The development of the black queenside comes too late

29.h7 dxe5 30.\(\mathbb{I}\)hq8 e4 31.h8\(\mathbb{W}\) exd3+ 32.cxd3 #c5 33. #h6 #f5 34. #1q5 Black resigned.

SI 34 4

☐ Kapengut ■ Begun

Soviet Union 1985

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 9 f6 5.9 c3 9 c6 6.9 db5 9 b4

The old main line is rarely played these days. 7. @ f4

This leads to complicated play. For 7.a3 @xc3+ 8.42xc3, see the game Shiroy-Grischuk.

7...@xe4 8.\f3!

Winning the rook on a8 is very reckless: 8 Oc7+ Of8 9 Oxa82! Wf6! 10 Wf3 Oxo3 11. Qd2? @d4 12. Wd3 We5+ 13. Qe3 @a4+ 14.c3 @xb2, and White resigned, Reggio-Tarrasch, Monte Carlo 1902. 8 4512

After 8...@xc3?! 9 bxc3 @a5 10 @d6+ :: #8

11.0-0-0 White has good prospects. 9.6 c7+ cf8

The king is probably safer here than on e7. After 9... \$\psie 67?! 10.0-0-0 \hat{\matheextent} xc3 11.bxc3 g5 12. ag3 f5 13. ac4!? White has dangerous attacking chances, e.g. 13,...\$f7 14.@xd5 \$g7 15. 2c7 We7 16. Zhe1. Gorelov-Timoschenko Moscow 1985 10.0-0-0 @xc3

The alternative is 10...axc311.bxc3 ab8 (or 11...g5 12.響xe4 響xc7 13.毫xc7 dxe4 14.h4, with a slight advantage for White; or 11...e5 12. axd5 ag5 13. axg5 wxg5+ 14. ab1. with a difficult position that is probably not bad for White) 12. 2xd5 exd5 13. \ xe4 dxe4 14. axd8+ @xd8 15. axb8 a6 16. ae2, with slightly better play for White.

11.bxc3 âa3+ 12.⊈b1 e5 12... Ib8 is strongly met by 13. 2b5. 13.4 xa8 exf4



14. wxd5!

Taking with the rook is incorrect: 14. \$\pm\$xd5? 響e7 15.âc4 âe6 16.星e1 g5 17.響h5 h6

18. Id3 如g7, with a winning position for Black, Chekhover-Romanovsky, Leningrad 1926.

14... we7

After 14...\#f6 15.\@c7 \#xc3 16.\#b3 White is better. Thus an old analysis by Ravinsky. 15. #b3 &d6 16. &c4 q6 17. &xf7!?

An interesting move. However, it is probably not stronger than 17. The1, after which 17... @e5! 18.g3 f3 19. @d5 \$g7 20. @xf3 leads to an unclear position, according to Kapengut.

17...**\$**q7

And not 17... wxf7? 18. wxf7+ wxf7 19. axd6, with advantage for White.

Black slips up. Correct was 18... @e5! 19.g3 with unclear play. Kapengut. 19.2d5! 2f5 20.₩b5

Threatening 21. axc6 bxc6 22 wxe5 20... Ie8 21.g3 g5 After 21...fxg3 White plays 22.f4.

22.h4 a6 Black is lost, also after 22...h6 23.hxe5 hxe5

24.gxf4 gxf4 25.IIg1+. 23.₩b3 fxg3 24.fxg3 @g4 25.\d3 Ixa8 26.2xc6 bxc6 27.Ixe5! ₩xe5

28. #b7+ @q6 29. #xa8 Black resigned.

SI 34 4

☐ Shirov

■ Grischuk Linares 2001

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 e6 6.@db5 @b4 7.a3 @xc3+ 8.@xc3 d5 9.@d3

Here, according to the books, 9,exd5 exd5 10.2d3 0-0 11.0-0 gives White slightly more pleasant play, although his advantage doesn't amount to much. Hence the text

Black can safely play 9...dxe4 10.4 xe4 6 xe4 10. ab5+ ad7 11. axd7+ 實xd7 12 exd5 @xd5 here, and in both cases he has no great problems.

10. 2e2 e5 11.0-0 0-0 12.h3 Ⅱe8 13. 4 q3 &e6?!

13... ad7 is a better idea, when 14.f4 is met by 14...exf4 15. axf4 @de5 16. Wh5 f6, with quite a playable position for Black, Ponomariov-Kortchnoi, Donetsk 2001.

14.f4 exf4 15.@xf4 @d7?!

According to Shirov, Black could have played 15...h6 here.



16.\\h5! a6

Now 16...f6? won't work in view of 17.e5, and 16... 168 is met by 17.e5 2g6 18. 2e4, with advantage for White.

17. Wh6 Wf6

Other possibilities won't really do either. Shirov gives 17...f6 18.e5! @cxe5 19.@h5! We7 20. axe5 fxe5 21. axg6 hxg6 22. axg6+ ah8 23. 2f6 2xf6 24. Ixf6 Wh7 25. Wg5 IIg8 26. wxe5, winning, and 17... ce5 18. cf5! @xf5 19.exf5 @xd3 20.fxg6 hxg6 21.@g5. with advantage for White.

18. 2g5 ₩g7 19. ₩h4 @ce5 19...h5 can be met strongly by 20.@e2. 20. ah6 wh8 21. af5! axf5 21...gxf5 22.exf5 is hopeless, of course 22.exf5 @xd3 23.cxd3 we5

White was threatening 24.f6. 24 Tf41

Now the white attack quickly strikes home. 24...@c5 25. af1 @xd3 26.fxq6 fxq6 After 26...@xf4 White plays 27.gxf7+ \$xf7 28. IIxf4+, and wins

27. If7 @c5 28. Ig7+ wh8 29. Iff7 @e6 30. Exg6 d3 31. Eg4 Eg8 32. Exh7+ Black resigned

SI 34.5

☐ Petrovic Chekhov

Pula 1990

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 2f6 5.2c3 €c6 6.€xc6

If White doesn't feel like transposing to the Sveshnikov, this is the best way to try for an opening advantage.

6...bxc6 7.e5 @d5 8.@xd5?!

This causes Black few problems. For the better move 8. 2e4, see the next three games. 8...cxd5 9.2d3 #c7 10.#e2

After 10.f4 &c5 Black has good play. After 10. £f4, 10... **E**b8 is awkward, as 11. **E**b1? will cost White a pawn: 11... 基xb2! 12. 基xb2 變c3+ 13.如e2 wxb2, Marshall-Mieses, Monte Carlo 1903. So White should go 11. Wc1, when 11...d6 12.exd6 @xd6 13.@xd6 @xd6 yields Black good play.

10...âb4+! 11.af1

11.c3? runs into 11...@xc3+. of course

11... Ib8 12.h4?

In order to deploy the rook with 13, \$\mu\$h3. But now Black has an amusing trick. White's position, by the way, is already doubtful. See. for example, 12.2f4 ac5 13.b3 0-0 14.h4 f6 15. Wh5 f5 16. We2 Ib4! 17.c4 (or 17. ad2 Ee4! 18. €xe4 fxe4, with compensation for the exchange) 17...dxc4 18.\(\hat{a}\)xc4 \(\hat{a}\)a6. with good play for Black, Shabanov-Filippov, Elista 1996.



12....@c3! 13.f4

Taking the bishop is no better: 13.bxc3 \u22a7xc3 14 響 o4 0-0 15. ab2 (15. ge2 響 xal 16. ab6 doesn't vield anything either: 16...\u00earxe5+) 15... axb2 16. ah3 wxe5, with a winning position for Black, Rigo-Horvath, Budapest 1980. 13.... xb2

Black has won a pawn in a superior position. The rest is silence

êxd3 20.cxd3 ₩b2+ 21.dd1 ₩b1+ 22. dd2 wxa2+ 23. c3 Za4 Whire resigned.

SI 34 6

☐ Movsesian ■ Stocek

166

Czech Republic 2001

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 ac6 5.0c3 af6 6.0xc6 bxc6 7.e5 ad5 8 @e4 @a62!

This is a rather dubious move. For 8...f5. see Bukal-Stein and for 8... #a5+, Chandler-Nunn. A much played continuation is 8... #c7 9 f4 Wb6, e.e. 10.c4 &b4+ 11.de2 f5 12.0f2 ec5 13 のd3 のe3 14 響b3 のxf1 15.響xb6 @xb6 16. Exf1 @a6, with approximately equal

play. The latest vogue is 8... £b7 9. £e2 c5 10.0-0 ₩c7 11.6 d6+ &xd6 12.exd6 ₩c6. made fashionable by Peter Leko.

9 c4

9.2xa6 #a5+ 10.2d2 #xa6 leads to an roughly equal position.

9...@b4+ 10.@d2 wh4 11.wf3!

Weaker is 11.g4? @e3! 12.₩a4 @xd2+ 13 中xd2 のxe4 14 響xa6 @xe5 15.@c3 ₩xf2+ 16 @e2 \$\overline{2}\$ and Black had a strong attack Indit Polear-San Segundo, Madrid 1995 After 11 Wc22! Black also has the strong 11...@e3.

11...f5

The exchange 11... axd2+ 12. axd2 is good for White due to the weakness of square d6. 12.@d6+ @xd6 13.cxd5 @xf1 14.exd6



14.... b5?!

Earlier games had shown that 14... 2c4 is good for White, e.g. 15.dxc6 ad5 16. f4 fxf4 17.cxd7+ \$\div xd7 18.\div xf4, but in view of the opposite-coloured bishops Black probably doesn't need to despair. The text, however, is not a substantial improvement on Black's play. 15 dxe6 0-0

15...dxe6 is met by 16.a4 @xa4 17.@f4 @b5 18.d7+, with an attack. Now the oppositecoloured bishops are to White's advantage! 16.exd7 Zad8 17.0-0-0 ₩c4+

Or 17 Txd7 18. Wf4, with advantage for White

18. 2 c3 ₩xa2 19. The1 Txd7 20 Te7 Ifd8 21 Ide1 #a1+ 22 doc2 #a22

This loses. No better was 22...@a4+. as Black is finished after 23.b3 @xb3+ (23 Wa2+ 24. âb2) 24. \$\dag{\phi}xb3 \$\pi b8+ 25 \$\dag{\phi}b4 \$\text{Rut}\$ 22... 響a4+ 23.b3 響g4 was certainly worth a try, according to an editorial comment in Informator 81

23 Te8+ Tyes 24 Tyes+ &f7 25 Wh5+ q6 26. Ie7+ \$f8

After 26... Exe7 27 Wxh7+ Black is also finished 27. Wh6+

Black resigned.

SI 34.6

☐ Chandler

Nunn

London 1998

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 2f6 5.0c3 0c6 6.0xc6 bxc6 7.e5 ⊘d5 8.@e4 \a5+ 9.c3 \a6

A playable alternative is 9...f5, e.g. 10.exf6 e.p. @xf6 11.@d6+ (or 11.@xf6+ exf6 12. ac2 aa6 13. axa6 wxa6 14. wh5+ ac7 15. 2e3 d6, with approximate equality, Poletaev-O.Junge, correspondence game 1958) 14.总f4 由f7 15.響d2 d5, with a roughly equal position, Niiboer-Ankerst, Leeuwarden 1993

10 g d3 f52!

More accurate is 10, \$e7, 11,0-0, \$xd3. 2b6 14. Iel h6 15. 2f3 ₩b5 the position is approximately equal. Koyaley-Ikonnikov. Schwäbisch Gmünd 1994.

11.exf6 e.p. @xf6 12.b4! ₩b6 12...\\exists e5? is refuted by 13.f4 13. ûe3

An important gain of tempo!

13... 賞b7 14. 公xf6+ gxf6 15. 賞h5+ 会e7

This is forced as 15 \$2d8 16 \$\frac{1}{2}a5+ costs Black a bishon!

16. 9 c5+ d6?

This is refuted. Black should have tried 16... dd8: White wins a pawn after 17. dxa6 (maybe 17. #f7!? is stronger) 17... #xa6 18. xf8 耳xf8 19. wxh7, but after 19. wc4 Black has some form of counterplay after all. 17. 2 xa6 ₩xa6



18. axd6+! wxd6 19. Wf7!

Cutting off the black king's retreat. Black is lost

19...@h6

Or 19 f5 20.f4, and it's all over. 20. Id1+ se5 21. 響h5+ ag5 22. Id4! Black resigned. There is no parrying 23.f4+.

SI 34 6

Bukal ■ Stein, Bernd

Dortmund 1993

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9 xd4 ②f6 5.公c3 公c6 6.公xc6 bxc6 7.e5 公d5 8.@e4 f5 9.exf6 e.p. @xf6 10.@d6+ £xd6 11.₩xd6 ₽a6!?

A well-known pseudo-sacrifice in this position, but 11... \$\begin{aligned}
b6 is also a playable move. 12 c4

An ambitious plan. White's reply 12.\(\hat{\omega}\)xa6 \(\mathbf{w}_35\)+13.\(\hat{\omega}\)d2 \(\mathbf{w}\)xa6 14.\(\hat{\omega}\)b4 looks strong but after 14...\(0-0-0\) or 14...\(\delta\)f7 Black is fine. 12...\(\mathbf{w}\)b6 13.\(\hat{\omega}\)d3

The best way to parry the hidden threat 13... 實來f2+. 13.c5 實b4+ 14.實d2 豐xd2+ 15.盒xd2 盒xf1 16.戛xf1 包d5 gives Black good prospects.



13... £xc4! Surprising and strong, but probably not win-

ning. 14.≙xc4 ⊘e4 15.₩a3

White's best option. Bad is 15. #F4? #W64+, while 15. #G3?! #wf2+ 16. #cd1 #ws2
17. #E1 %21-2 18. #S4? #wf2 favours Black:
19. #d6 #Ef8 20. &cd2 #Ef5 21. &cb4 c5 22. &c5
#Ef5 23. &c1 #wf2 24. #Cf #Eg4, and White
resigned. Kether-Stein. Karlsruhe 1988.

15... **wxf2+ 16. 全d1 要d4+** And not 16... **w**xg2? 17.其f1.

17. 2d3 @f2+

The crucial position of this variation. 18. ★c2!

The game Adorjan-Quinteros, Amsterdam 1977, saw 18.jac.? 2 2xh1 19.ac.3 增估5! 20.jac.1 增结5! 21.ga 直防8! 22.ac.1 量太2.23.ac.5 置伤+!, and White resigned. This game gave 12.c4 a bad reputation for years. 18.ac.2xh1 19.ac.65!

The point of the previous move. White wins

al is roughly balanced (two bishops against rook and two pawns). The white king is reasonably safe on c2, but things remain exceedingly complicated, because Black may still be able to win the white g and h-pawns.

19...c5 20. Ixh1 #d5 21. 2d2 0-0
After 21... #xg2 White has the annoying

22.Eel. 22.Efl Exfl 23.exfl Ef8 24.ed3 Ef2

22.If1 IX11 23.EX11 II18 24.E03 III2 25.Exa7 #g5 Or 25.Exg2 26.Ec3 #xh2 (26...IXd2

Or 25... 響家2 26.亞c3 響xh2 (26... 4kg2 27. 響xd7 宣f2 28. 響xe6+ is not clear either) 27. 響xd7 響e5+ 28.亞c2, with an unclear position, according to Nikitin.

26.豐a5 全f7 27.皇e4 豐f4 28.皇f3 d5 29.中c1 耳f1+

Black settles for a draw. The alternative 29...響xh2 30.響a7+ 空g6 31.響xc5 饗g1+ 32.盒d1 蓋xg2 33.響c6 壹f6 34.響c3+ is by no means clear.

SI 41 6

☐ Skripchenko
■ Cramling

Belgrade 1996

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4

This plan, with the small transposition 4...\(\mathbb{w}\) 65.\(\pi\)2c3 \(\preceq \)2c4 \(\preceq \)2c4 (2), was thought up in the '60s by the Swedish opening guru Rolf Martens and baptised GaPA. It was only when he mentioned it in the introduction to a remarkable article in the Swedisch magazine SKK-Bulletinen 1988/1 and subsequently devoted a series of articles to it in Schacknytt, that the idea acquired a following.

6.e5 ac5 7.ae3

This is an automatic response. In the rapid game Van den Doel-McShane, Brussel 2000, White played 7.exf6 &xd4 8.fxg7 &xg7 9.∰g4 (9.€b5!? at once is also worth considering) 9....£d4 10.₩g3. After 10...£c6 11...£c6 11...£c5 £e5? 12.£f4! Black quickly landed himself in insurmountable trouble on the dark squares. The endgame after 11...£d 12.£c7+ ₩xc7 13.₩xc7 2e5 14.₩xe5 €xe5 15.2e3, however, is also better for White. Black should probably go for 10...₩b4 11.3. 2xc34 12.bxc3 ₩f8, followed by 13...£g8. 7...£d5

Black has no choice. Bad is 7... 響xb2? 8. ②a4, or 7... ②g4? 8. 響xg4 響xb2 9. ②d1 響xal 10. 響xg7 里78 11. ②b5, and White wins in both cases.

8.9 xd5 exd5 9.9 f5



An attempt at refutation! But 9.急e2 ②c6 10.03 is probably simply strong for White, e.g. 10...②xe5 11.b4 盒xd4 12.急xd4 響e6 13.0-0. And 9.②b5 0-0 10.急xc5 響xc5 11.變d4 is also good for White.

9...@xb2!?

9...âxe3 10.0d6+ \$e7 may also be playable: 11.0f5+ \$d8 12.0xe3 ₩xb2.

10. £xc5?!

This is not the way to go! $10\cdot \Omega dot ?!$ $\Delta x dot \\ 11\cdot \alpha x dot \oplus b ds + also favours Black, as does <math>10\cdot \Omega x g 7 + ?!$ Δds , while after $10\cdot f 4 ?!$ $\Delta x cos \\ 11\cdot \Omega x cos \oplus b ds + 12\cdot b ds = 2 t cos \\ 2 t x cos \oplus b ds + 12\cdot b ds = 2 t cos \\ 2 t x cos + 12\cdot$

Or 11.₩d2 ₩xa1+ 12.&e2 ₩xe5+ 13.₩e3 (after 13.&d1 ₩xf5 14.2d3 (or 14.2b5 2c6 15.Æe1+ wd8, and White has nothing) 14...₩h5+ 15.æe2 ₩h6 16.₩xd5 4c6 17.Æe1 &d8 White has instificient compensation for his rook) 13...₩xe3+14.4xe3 d6! 15.£xd6+ wd7 16.£xf7 (16.£ 3 xc6) 16...Xe6+ 17.&d2 &c6, and according to Cramline. Black is better.

11... wxc5 12. d6+ wf8 13.f4



13, #d2 won't do either: 13...\(\text{Qc6}\) 6.4\(\pm\)f4 \\ #xc2+15.\(\pm\)c8\(\pm\)f2+16.\(\pm\)d3\(\pm\)xc5.norwill 13.\(\pm\)xc8.\(\pm\)c6: 14.\(\pm\)d6.\(\pm\)c95.\(\pm\)5.\(\pm\)f5.\(\pm\)f5.\(\pm\)f5.\(\pm\)f5.\(\pm\)f5.\(\pm\)f5.\(\pm\)f6

13... ①c6 14. 审f3 f6! 15. ②xc8 fxe5! 16. fxe5 ②xe5+ 17. □f4 互xc8 18. □xe5 18. □f62 also turns out to be uscless after 18. □f6

18... 且e8+ 19. 全f5 且e4! 20. 學f3 學e7 White resigned.

SI 41.7

☐ Tisdall

London 1982

1.d4 e6 2.e4 c5 3.0f3 cxd4 4.0xd4 0f6 5.0c3 ûb4

The Pin variation, which leads to extremely sharp play.

6.e5 @e4?

Unfortunately, the interesting possibility 7.. \(\mathbb{w}\)a can't save this line either. An example is Makarov-Gulko, Soviet Union 1963; 8.\(\mathbb{w}\)cas 4 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 5 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 8 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 1 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 8 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 2 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 4 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 6 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 7 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 6 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 6 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 7 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 6 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 7 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 6 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 7 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 6 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 7 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 8 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 7 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 7 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 7 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 8 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 7 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 7 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 7 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 8 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 7 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 7 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 8 \(\mathbb{w}\)cas 7 \(\m

8. wxg7 If8 9.a3 4b5+

Other moves are no better: 9...\$\&a\$ 10.\&h6\$ \\
\text{we}\ r\$ 11.\&\text{Dis}\ \, \text{o}\ \text{o}\ \text{w}\ \text{d}\ \\
\text{11.}\&\text{Dis}\ \text{o}\ \text{o}\ \text{o}\ \text{o}\ \text{d}\ \text{o}\ \text{d}\ \text{

10.axb4 @xd4 11.êg5 ₩b6

12.≗d3

The theory books give the old game Szabo-Mikenas, Kemeri 1939: 12.\(\text{\text{\text{\$\grace}}}\) 12.\(\text{\text{\$\grace}}\) 13.\(\text{\text{\$\grace}}\) 7 \(\text{\text{\$\grace}}\) 8 16.\(\text{\text{\$\grace}}\) 6, with a large advantage for White. The text looks at least as strong.

12...d6 or 12...d5 may be better moves. 13.\(\text{\tinc{\text{\ti}\text{\texi{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi{\texi{\texi\tin\tii}\text{\tex{\texit{\texi}\text{\texi}\text{\text{\texi{\text{\texiclex{\text



15.e6! d5

SI 41.7

☐ Chavez

■ Estevez Morales

Nicaragua 1981

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 @b4 6.e5 @d5 7.@g4 0-0!?

⊕f6 5.⊕c3 Ձb4 6.e5 ⊕d5 7.₩g4 0-0!?

An unclear exchange sacrifice that yields Black some prospects. Instead of the text, 7...g6?! 8.Ձd2 is simply good for White.

8.ଛh6 g6 9.ଛxf8 ₩xf8 10.@e2 @c6 11.₩g3 d6! 12.0-0-0?!

After 12.exd6 盒xd6 Black's strong bishops give him good compensation for the exchange. Maybe 12.a3!?is White's best move, although after 12... 過去5?: 13.exd6 盒xd6 14.慢度5 息xd6 盒xd6 14.慢度5 息xd6 5 14.bxc5 ₩xc5, or 13.b4 ②xc5 14.bxc5 ᡚe4 15.慢f4 d5 Black is fairly OK.

A good square for the bishop! Square c2 is coming under attack.

16 @c3?

This is refuted, but after 16.\$\pi\$1 Black plays 16.\$\pi\$28, after which the intended 17.\$\Pi\$c1 fails to 17.\$\Pi\$xc2+!

fails to 17...\$\text{\omega}\text{c}2+!.

16...\$\text{\omega}\text{xa}3! 17.bxa3 \vert\text{w}\text{xa}3+ 18.\text{\omega}\text{d}2

18.业b1 is also met by 18...业xc2+. 18...业xc2! 19.业d3?!

19.\$xc2 &b4+ is equally hopeless: 20.\$d1 \$\pi_1 + 21.\$\phi_2 &xd5 22.\$\pi_xd5 \$\pi_2+.\$ 19...\$\phi_3! 20.\$\pi_1 &xd5 21.\$\pi_xd5 \$\pi_2+.\$

19...≙b3! 20.⊑c1 ≙xd5 21.⊕xd5 ₩a2 22.☆e1 ₩xd5

White resigned.

SI 41.7

☐ Ftacnik
■ Helmers

Ginvik 1983

1.0f3 c5 2.e4 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 0.f6 5.0c3 âb4 6.e5 0.d5 7.\dotsq 4.00

8. \(\hat{\text{a}}\) (2! \(\hat{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\t

the next game. 10.âh6 g6 11.âxf8

An alternative is 11.h4!?. White spurns the exchange – his £h6 will come in handy when he starts attacking the black king. In the game Hansen-Kristensen. Danish championship 1998, there followed: 11...285 12.28/3 dol 13.2b5 2c6 14.h5!? 2xe5 15.f4 £d7 16.fxe5 ±xb5 17.£xb5 @xb5, with complicated play.

11... xf8 12. 2d3 d6! 13. #g3

After 13.exd6, 13...e5 14.©15 is unclear, but 13... wxd6 is not bad for Black, according to the Dutch master Jeroen Bosch. 13.. wx 14.0-0 dxe5

Less good is 14...\u00earxe5?! in view of 15.f4, followed by 16.f5.

15.@f3 @d7!

The position is very hard to assess. 17.265 WC7 18.2xd7 2xd7 19.2xc5 2xd6 20.14 has also been suggested, but in this variation 19...268 (instead of 19...266) is good for Black, Bosch. With the text White launches an attack

17...豐c7! 17...盒g7? is bad in view of 18.盒xg6! 豐xg3

19.≙xf7+. 18.₩h4 ②f6 Black has to be careful: 18...h6?! can be mer

by 19.4xe6! fxe6 20.4xg6.

19.@xe6? @xe6 20.₩xf6 @xa2 is good for Black.

19...e4!

20. 2xe4 2xe4 21. 2xe4 2d7 22. If3



22...≜c6

22...f5!? 23...d3 ...c6 was better. The white attack has run out of steam and Black still has two strong bishops for the exchange.

23. £xc6

23.黉e1!? may be slightly stronger.

23... wxc6 24. Ifd3 wxc2 25. Id7 wxa2 26. #f6 &c5+ 27. #h1 IIf8 28.h4 h5 29. Ixb7 管c2 30. Id8

Draw. Black has perpetual check after 30...響cl+31.gh2 響el+

SI 41 7

☐ Walsh ■ Amann

Correspondence game 1998

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 &b4 6.e5 @d5 7. @d2!? This is probably White's strongest move. 7...@xc3 8.bxc3 &e7 9.wq4 0-0 10.âd3!? d6 11.âh6 q6



12.f4!?

White is not interested in the exchange! 12...@d7 13.h4!? dxe5 14 h5! @f6 14...exd4? is impossible in view of 15.hxg6, of course

15. #g3 @xh5 16. Exh5 exd4 17.0-0-0!? Steijn-Cornu, correspondence game 1990. went as follows: 17 中行 dxc3 18 日ab1 Wd4+ 19. drf1 @d7? (better is 19... ad8!, and Black holds: 20.全g5 全xg5 21.響xg5 罩d5! 22.f5! Exf5+ 23.2xf5 exf5 24.Exh7 ₩d1+, thus

and White had a winning attack.

17... @ a3+ Bad is 17...dxc3? 18. adh1, followed by a.g5.

18. dd2 Ie8

According to Bosch, 18...dxc3+!? is also worth considering

19. #dh1 dxc3+ 20. @d1



20...@e7?

Now the white attack strikes home. According to Walsh, Black should have played 20...e5, e.g. 21.fxe5 @d7! 22.E5h4 @e7 23.8g5 h5 (or 23...@xg5 24.\\xe\xe5 \\\d\dots 25.基xh7 賞xe5 26.賞h4 息f5!) 24. @ xe7 其xe7 25. axh5 wg4+ 26. e2 gxh5 27. exg4 £xg4+28. \$c1, with an approximately equal endgame, or 21, 2g5 gxh5! 22. Exh5 (and not 22. axd8+? ag4+) 22... wd7! 23.f5 f6 24. axf6+ af8 25. ag5 實c7, with an unclear position.

21. £g7! £f6

The only move

22. 9 xf6 Wxf6 23. 11xh7 9d7

in both cases with a win for White.

24 We3!

With the threat of 25.f5, followed by Wh6, or IIh6. or g4-g5, 24. 2xg6? fxg6! 25. IIh6 (or 25. Ixd7 Iad8, or 25. I7h6 管d4+ 26. 中c1 里e7) 25... 營d4+26. 空e2 总b5+27. 空f3 營d1+

would have been incorrect, again according to Bosch.

24... of8 25.f5! oe7

After 25...exf5 26. \$\mathbb{I}\$h8+ or 25...gxf5 26. \$\mathbb{I}\$1h6

26.fxq6 If8 27.\c5+ \c5+ \c8 28.qxf7+

Black resigned in view of 28... \$\pixf7 29.\$\pih8+\$ 耳f8 30.息g6+!.

SI 41 7

Wagman ■ Barle

Rial 1981

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @f6 5.@c3 &b4 6.e5 @d5 7.@d2 @xc3 8.bxc3 @a5?!

This is not the best spot for the bishop. Better is 8... 2e7, to help defend the kingside. 9. @ a4! n-n

9...\$f8 is not a nice move. After 10.2d3 d6 11.f4 White has the better prospects.

10. 2d3 d6

Other moves are no better. A few examples: 10... 響c7 11.0-0 響xe5 12. ae1 響d6 13. af4 響b6 14.êxh7+! \$xh7 15.星e3 響d8 16.星g3 g6 17. ê.e5, and wins, A. Vitolinsh-Pavlenko, Dniepropetrovsk 1976, and 10...@c6 11. 2xc6 bxc6 12. We4 g6 13.h4 f5 14. Wf4 耳f7 15.g4 fxg4 16.豐xg4 豐b6 17.h5! 豐xf2+ 21.swe2!, with winning play. Even without the queen the white attack strikes home, Pvhälä-Seppanen, Helsinki 1992

11.@f3 a6

After 11...dxe5? the bishop sacrifice on h7 is already winning: 12.2xh7+! axh7 13.8h5+ 查g8 14. ②g5 Ie8 15. 賞xf7+ \$h8 16. 賞h5+

空g8 17.響h7+ 空f8 18.響h8+ 空e7 19.費xp7+.

12.h4! dxe5 13.h5 f5

Otherwise White takes on g6. But the weakening text-move give White a chance to make a beautiful sacrifice.



14. 9 xf51 exf5

After 14... Ixf5 White plays 15.hxg6 h5 16. Exh5, and wins

15.賞c4+ 耳f7

Or 15...\$27 16.hxg6 \$xg6 17.@xe5+ \$f6 18. ag5+ axg5 19. ah4+.

16.hxg6 hxg6 17.@q5 @c7 18.@h4

\$ 19 @xf7 19. 圖h8+ 當e7 20. axf7 was the quickest way

to win.

After 20... \$\psi f6\$ White plays 21.\$\overline{2}g5+!, which also wins

21. ₩xg6+ \$d5 22. Ih6 @c6 23. ₩g8+ ©c5 24.∏b1 b5 25.âe3+ Ød4 26. 2xd4+ exd4 27. 2f8+ 2c4 28. 2g8+ \$c5 29.\\$xb5+!

The end of a successful king hunt, 29... 2xb5 30. @d5+ @c5 31.a4+ Black resigned.

Accelerated Fianchetto

With 2... 2c6 and 4...g6

SI 33.1

☐ Yordanov
■ Spiridonov

Sofia 1964

1.e4 c5 2.4f3 4c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.4xd4 g6 5.4xc6

g6 5.⊕xc6
A crude attempt to exploit 4...g6 that causes
Black no headaches to speak of.

5...bxc6 6.₩d4 ②f6 7.e5 ②g8 7... ②d5 is also a reasonable move, e.g. 8.e6 f6

9.exd7+ \(\hat{\omega}\)xd7, and Black is OK.

8.\(\hat{\omega}\)c4

After 8.e6 Black simply goes 8...②f6, e.g. 9.exf7+ 全xf7 10.②c3 d5, with excellent play. 8...②q7 9.數f4?!

Threatening mate; but with the text White actually endangers his own king! 9.0-0 f6 10.2xg8 (0.10.2xg8 11.2xg4 12.2xg4) for Black) 10...Zxg8 11.2xg4 12.2xg4 12.2xg4 13.2xg4 1

9...≝a5+ 10.ģf1

After other moves Black takes pawn e5 with check.

10...f5 11.exf6 e.p. ②xf6 12.2d2 wb6

13.全c3 d5! Logical and strong. 13...資xb2? 14.互b1 資xc2 15.互b8, on the other hand, is bad.

₩xc2 15.<u>□</u>b8, on the other hand, is bad. 14.**②a4** ₩d8 15.**②d3 0-0**

Now the consequences of White's weak ninth move becomes clear. Black is threatening 16... 4e4. 16.f3 e5 17.₩g5

21...@xd2 22.\\\\\xd2

2 ****** 2 ***** 2 ***** 2 ***** 2 ***** 2 ***** 3 ***** 4 ***** 4 ***** 4 ***** 4 ***** 5 *****

22... ₩g5! 23. Id1

White is lost in all variations: 23.\pixg5\hat{1}\hat{2}\d4+, and mate, or 23.\pif2\bar{1}\axf3 24.\pixf3\hat{2}\d4+. 23...\bar{1}\axf3!\bar{2}4.\pixg5\hat{2}\d4+ White resigned in view of 25.\bar{1}\axf3 \bar{2}\d4 \bar{1}\bar{1}\tag{1}\tag{1}\tag{1}\tag{2}\d5

SI 33.2

☐ Kelson
■ Silman

Reno 1993

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 g6 5.@c3 @g7 6.@e3 @f6 7.@xc6 bxc6

8.e5 @a8

For 8...@d51?, see the next two games Frolov-Shabalov and Larsen-Hartung Nielsen.

After 9.\(\hat{2}\)d4 Black's best is 9...f6, but 9...\(\hat{2}\)h6, 9...\(\hat{2}\)ad 9...c5 have also been played.

10.\#f3

The most common move is 10.\(\mathbb{w}\)(2. An example is the game Computer Fritz-2-Kasparov, Germany 1994: 10.-0. 0-11.0-0-0 did 12.exd6 exd6 13.\(\mathbb{w}\)(xd6) (2 typical computer move!) 13..\(\mathbb{w}\)(xd6 14.\(\mathbb{L}\)(xd6 \)(2/5 15.\(\mathbb{L}\)(3.\(\mathbb{w}\)(xd6 14.\(\mathbb{L}\)(xd6 \)(2/5 15.\(\mathbb{L}\)(3.\(\mathbb{w}\)(xd6 14.\(\mathbb{L}\)(xd6 \)(2/5 15.\(\mathbb{L}\)(3.\(\mathbb{w}\)(xd6 14.\(\mathbb{L}\)(xd6 \)(2/5 15.\(\mathbb{M}\)(xd8 \)(2/5 1

10...0-0 11.0-0-0

After 11.åc4 Black has the strong reply 11...d51.eg. 12.exd6e.p.exd6 13.\(\frac{1}{2}\) xe6 \(\frac{1}{2}\) d \(\frac{1}{2}\) \(\frac{1}{2}\) exd6 \(\frac{1}{2}\) d \(\frac{1}{2}\) \(\frac{1}2\) \(\frac{1}{2}\) \(\frac{1}2\) \(\frac{1}2\) \(\frac{1}2\) \(\frac{1}2\) \(\frac{1}2\) \(\frac{1}2\) \(\frac



12. wxc6?!

Taking this pawn is extremely risky! It makes more sense to prevent the threat 12...2g4 with 12.h3, after which Black plays 12...2c7 or 12...25

12... ad7 13. wd5 @g4 14. wf3

This is virtually forced. After 14.exd6 Black has the very strong 14... ♠xe3 15.dxe7 ₩xe7 16.₩xd7 ₩b4; 14...♠d4 is met by 14...dxe5 15.fxe5 &e6; and after 14...♠g1 Black has the annoving 14...♠f6!.

18.②xe7+ 豐xe7 19.exd6 is refuted by 19...国xc2+! 20.並xc2 全f5+ 21.並d2 豐xd6+ 22.全d3 豐b4+ 23.並e2 全g4+.

18... axd5 19. Ixd5 Ixd5 20.cxd5 wa5
If he hasn't already, White will now start seriously regretting his 12th move!

21.ac4 Ic8 22.b3 Wxa2 23.Ie1
This looks like the only sensible move, but Black has a refutation at hand.

23...dxe5 24.fxe5



24....£h6!

Simple and elegant. White cannot prevent Black liquidating to a winning queen ending. 25. #\pi Alba #\pi Alba 26. Eled #\pi Alba 47. #\pi Alba 48. #\pi Alba

SI 33.2

Frolov

■ Shahalov Moscow 1991

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 g6 5.âe3 @f6 6.@c3 âg7 7.@xc6 bxc6 8.e5 @d5!?

An interesting pawn sacrifice. Its consequences are not entirely clear, but it yields Black all kinds of chances

9. €xd5 cxd5 10. ₩xd5 ⊒b8 11. £c4 For the other move, 11.2xa7, see the game Larsen-Hartung Nielsen. 11...0-0 12.0-0-0

Now 12.2xa7 is very suspect in view of 12.... ab7 13. 實d2 實c7! 14. axb8 實xc4. e.g 15. 2a7 2xg2 16. Ig1 2xe5 17.c3 2c6, with advantage for Black. 12.0-0 was certainly an option: 12... 2b7 13. #d3 2xe5 14. 2xa7 Ec8 15. ad4 axh2+ 16. axh2 實c7+ 17. ag1 實xc4, with an unclear endgame. Who is better? 12...d6

12... #c7 has also been played. An example is Firman-Efimenko, Lvov 2001: 13. 2b3 2xe5 14.響c5 a5 15.單d5 響xc5 16.單xc5 息xb2+ 17.\$xb2 a4 18.\$c7 axb3 19 cxb3 and now Black's best bet possibly was 19...f5!?. The nosition is unclear

13. 9 xa7 IIh4



14. @ b3

A good alternative is 14.@c5!?, e.g. 14...@e6 (or 14...e6 15. wxd6 wxd6 16. 2xd6 xc4 17. £xf8 £xf8 18. The l, and the endgame is marginally better for White) 15. wxe6 fxe6 16 @xe6+ \$b8 17 @xb4 @xe5 18 f3 and White has slightly better prospects, according to Frolov.

14... 賞c7?!

This has a happy ending, but 14... £xe5, followed by ... @e6 may be a better idea.

15.exd6!? ₩xa7 16 d7 Trh3 17.dxc8@2!

I think White should have played the stronger 17.axb3!? here, and it is doubtful whether Black will get enough compensation for the exchange, e.g. 17... 2xd7 18. wxd7 wal+ 19. ad2 實xb2 20.g3,

17... 2xb2+ 18. 2b1 2b8! 19. 2h3! âq7+ 20. dc1 âb2+

Being a queen down, Black happily settles for a draw by perpetual check, of course. But according to Tal and Vaganian, 20 ... e6!? comes into consideration. Black keeps at least a draw by perpetual check and he can meet 21. Wdf3 with 21... #fc8, intending 22... #xc2+!. 21. ab1 @ a7+

Draw

SI 33.2

☐ Larsen, Pelle **■** Hartung Nielsen

Copenhagen 1995

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 g6 5.4c3 &g7 6.ke3 4f6 7.4xc6 bxc6 8.e5 @d5!? 9.@xd5 cxd5 10.@xd5 Ib8 11. axa7 Exb2 12. ad4 Exc2 13. ad3 e6 14. wa8 Ic6 15. wa4?!

An unfortunate move, A better option is 15. ab5, after which Black can play 15... Za6! 16. axa6 響a5+ 17. 全f1 0-0 18. 響e4 (or 18. #a7!? Axa6+ 19. **g1, with an unclear position. Black's best bet is 19... @xe5 meeting 20.h4 with 20... #d5, according to an analysis by Petursson) 18... axa6+ 19. cg1 d6, and Black has good counterplay.

15.0-0 is also possible; White takes his king to safety. A possible continuation then is 15...0-0 16.ŵb5 ŵa6! 17.₩xd8 Xxd8 18. axc6 axf1 19. axf1 dxc6, with a roughly equal endgame, e.g. 20. ac3 Id3 21. Ic1 Id5 22.f4 g5 23.fxg5 @xe5 24.@xe5 Exe5 draw. Ribeiro-Lopez, Ciego de Avila 1996. 15... Wh4!

8 888

15... 響c7!? is also good: 16.0-0 axe5 17.ab5 Axd4 18. 響xd4 e5 19. 耳fe1 耳c5 20.a4 0-0 21. 8b4 d6, with advantage for Black. Löffler-Claverie, Cannes 1996 16 @h52

Now White will lose quickly. But 16.g3 \u22agg4 won't solve White's problems either, as we know from the game Lücke-Sander, Germany 1995: 17.f4 實f3 18.ad2 0-0.

16...₩e4+ 17.:d2 17.2e3 costs White his e-pawn. 17... gh6+ 18. gd1 0-0! 19. Ie1 After 19. axc6 Black plays 19... 實d3+, and

19... 常g4+ 20.f3 常xg2 21.星e2 常f1+

22.Ie1 wxf3+ 23.Ie2 wh1+ 24.Ie1 ₩xh2 25.Ie2 ₩h1+ 26.Ie1 ₩f3+

White has been completely stripped of material, so he resigned.

SI 33 2

☐ Varadi ■ Sabian

Correspondence game 1985

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.9xd4 @f6 5.@c3 g6?!

The semi-accelerated Dragon can justifiably be called a dubious side-variation

6. 4xc6 bxc6 7.e5 4 a8

Contrary to the variation just considered, 1.e4 c5 2.@f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 g6 5.@e3 2g7 6. 0c3 0f6 7. 0xc6 bxc6 8.e5 0d5!? (SI 33.2), 7...@d5? cannot be recommended here: 8. 4xd5 cxd5 9. 資xd5 單b8 10 e6! with the point 10...dxe6? (there is nothing better than 10...f6 11. £f4, with a large advantage for White) 11.We5, and Black loses a rook. This actually happened in the game Matsukevich-Kuznetsov, Tula 1957.

8. £c4 Wa5?!

8... £g7 9. #f3 f5 10. £f4 e6 11.0-0-0 #c7 is one of the most important variations in the black system. It is not clear whether White can actually create an advantage here, yet practice has shown that Black is running the biggest risks. An example is Van der Tak-Widera, correspondence game 2001: 12.h4 @h6 13.h5 @f7 (13...g5!?) 14.hxg6 hxg6 21. £b3 e5? (handing it to White on a plate) 22. @xd5! cxd5 23. wxd5 exf4 24. wc6+! かf8 25.c3! Ib8 26.axf7 響e5 27.Ixh8+ axf7 28.草h7+ 雪f8 29.彎h6+ 雪e8 30.彎g6+ 雪d8 31. #g8+ #e8 32. #g5+, and Black resigned. 9. £f4 £ a7 10. #f3

10.0-0 is also possible, e.g. 10...@xe5 11. £xe5 \ \ xe5 | 12. \ \ ze1 \ \ \ yf4 | 13. \ \ ze4 \ \ \ yf6 14. Ie3 d5 15. axd5! cxd5? (15... af5, as in Timman-Kortchnoi, Brussels 1991, is more stubborn) 16.響xd5 區b8 17.至e4 響g7 18.區b3 全b7 (or 18... 基xb3 19. 變c6+) 19. 基xb7, and White won in Honfi-Fabian, Budapest 1977.

10...e6

10...f6 is met strongly by 11.e6!, e.g. 11...d5 12.\(\hat{\alpha}\)5! winning.

11.0-0 @ xe5 12.b4 Wc7

12...豐xb4 13.皇xe5 f6 fails to 14.皇xe6!. 13.全b5 豐b8 14.皇xe5 豐xe5 15.夏ad1 d5 16 頁fe1 豐b8



17.₩c3

17. ቋ.አ. d5 ex.d5 18. ₩xd5 is another winning cominuation: 18... \$\phi 81.9 \ \psi c5+! \ \phi g7.20. \ \phi 62. \ \phi 64. \ \phi 62. \ \phi 64. \ \phi

17...f6

Or 17...e5 18.盒xd5 cxd5 19.罩xe5+ 少f8 20.罩exd5, and it's all over.

18. £xd5!

And each time this sacrifice decides the out-

come.

18...cxd5 19.≣xd5 ⊈f7

After 19...Qe7 20.Qd6+ &d7 21. \(\frac{1}{2} \)d3 Black is also lost, e.g. 21...\(\frac{1}{2} \)d5 22.\(\frac{1}{2} \)e4 \(\frac{1}{2} \)ad5 24.\(\frac{1}{2} \)e5 + Thus an analysis by the Hungarian Bottlik

20.互d8! wxb5 21.wc7+ @e7 22.互xh8 wxb4 23.c3 wh4 24.wd8 e5 25.互f8+ we6 26.互e8

SI 33 4

☐ Meszaros

■ Döry

Zalaegerszeg 1999

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 g6 5.@c3 @g7 6.@e3 @f6 7.@c4 0-0

8. £ b3 a5

The move of the Lithuanian player Uogele.

9.f3 d5 10.exd5 After 10.@xd5 @xd5 11.exd5 @b4 12.c4 a4 13.@c2 a3 14.b3 e5 Black has a sound position. For 10.@xd5. see the next game Milenk-

ovic-Ujhazi.

After 11.6db5 Black can play 11..ad! 12.6xa4 Qfxd5, e.g. 13.&d2 &d7 14.6bc3 &xa4 15.6xa4, and now the recommendation by Nielsen and Hansen 15..Exa4! 19.&f1 Wa5 20.&b3 Ed8, and Black has good compensation for the exchange.



13.Ձd2

 dence game 1970. 14_&xg7 &xxg7 15_&zf2 is less clear, but after 15...e5, possibly followed by...Exa4 and ...\@b6, Black has compensation for the sacrificed pawn. A playable option is 13_\pmx2; in Shirov-Lautier, Tilburg 1997, there followed 13_\pmx215 14.0-0 b5 155_\pmx23 \pmx23 16_\pmx23 \mathbb{\text{w}}xd1 17_\pmx17xd1 \mathbb{\text{w}}xc2, with an equal endeame.

13... Xa41?

13... £f5 has also been played here. 1 will have to refer you to the theory books.

14. @ xa4 Wb6!?

This move is an improvement on 14... wa5?! 15.a3 wa4 16.axb4 wc6 17.0-0 axb2 18.a5, and Black has insufficient compensation for the sacrificed exchange, Rogers-Laird, Brisbane 1994

15.a3

Bad is 15.\(\overline{a}\)b3? \(\overline{a}\)d8, e.g. \(16.\overline{a}\)xb4 \(\overline{a}\)xb4 \(17.\overline{a}\)c1 \(18.\overline{a}\)f3 \(18.\overline{a}\)d3 \(\overline{a}\)d3 \



19.b4?!

19 馬的!! is stronger: 19...金65 20.兔e3 温e5 21.竣行2 温xe3! 22.豐e3 金約6! 23.f4 心e4+ 24.竣行2 条件125.焚xc4 豐e6+26.竣动2 金5+ 27.竣d2 豐xc2+ 28.竣e1 豐xbl+ 29.豐c1, with an unclear position. Thus an analysis by the uncontained that the strong and the variation, incidentally!

19... a xa1 20.bxc5

20. ₩xal @e6 looks good for Black. He should have compensation for the pawn he is down

20... **b2 21. **pxb2 &xb2 22. &b4 &f6 Black has emerged from the complications with the better position. White shows only feeble resistance towards the end.

23. ♠c1?! ♠f5 24.c3 ♠g5 25. ♠f2? Here he should have played 25.0-0. 25...♣d2+ 26. ♠g3 鼍c2 27.♠b3 e5 28.f4 ♠xf4+ 29.♠f3 g5 White resigned.

SI 33 4

☐ Milenkovic

■ Ujhazi Kladovo 1992

1.e4 c5 2.0e2 0c6 3.0bc3 g6 4.d4 cxd4 5.0xd4 û.g7 6.ûe3 0f6 7.ûc4 0-0 8.ûb3 a5 9.f3 d5 10.ûxd5 0xd5 11.exd5

After 11. \(\text{\text{2}}\text{xd5}\) Black creates counterplay with 11...\(\text{5}\). The e4 pawn is undermined. 11...\(\text{\$\text{9}}\) b4 \quad 12. \(\text{\$\text{\$\text{0}}\) de2 \quad \(\text{\$\tex

by 14...Ec8 15.©d4 &xd4 (15...Exc3!? 16.bx3 ⊙xa2 has also been played) 16.\(\vec{w}\)xd4 \@xc2 17.\(\vec{x}\)xc2 \@xc2 18.\(\vec{a}\)big = 6 19.\(\vec{w}\)xd4 \@xc2 17.\(\vec{x}\)xc2 \@xc2 18.\(\vec{a}\)big to 5 19.\(\vec{w}\)xd5 f6, with an unclear position. You'll find more on this subject in the theory books. 14...\(\vec{x}\)xc2 + 15.\(\vec{x}\)xc2 \@xc2 16.\(\vec{w}\)xc2 b4 17.\(\vec{x}\)add 17.\(\vec{x}\)add 17.\(\vec{x}\)add 17.\(\vec{x}\)add 17.\(\vec{x}\)add 17.\(\vec{x}\)add 18.\(\vec{x}\)add 1

An important position for the Uogele variation. Although there are plenty games and analyses available, things remain unclear to this

17... wxd5 18. 2b6 we6 19. af2

After 19.0xa8 this sequence is possible: 19...\psixe3 \quad 20.0\text{\text{\text{0.6}}}\text{\text{0.7}} \quad \text{\text{\text{0.6}}}\text{\text{0.8}} \quad \text{\text{21.0}}\text{\text{0.6}}\text{\text{0.8}} \quad \text{\text{22.0}}\text{\text{xc3}} \quad \text{\text{23.axb4}} \quad \text{\text{\text{1.6}}}\text{1} \quad \text{24.0}\text{\text{d1}} \quad \text{a4} \quad 25.0\text{0.0}\text{0.3} \quad \text{\text{2.8}}\text{\text{0.6}}\text{1} \quad \text{1.8} \quad \text{2.8}\text{\text{1.6}}\text{1.8} \quad \text{1.8}

фh7 29.Да8 Дb3 30.Дc8 Дb2 31.Да8 Дb3 32. ac8 ab2, and a draw through move repetition. Thus an analysis by Bagirov.

19... Xab8 20. 0 f4 ₩a2 21.axb4 axb4 22 Td1

Other moves won't worry Black: 22.43fd5 b3 23. we2 単b7 24. ©b4 wa5 25. ©c6 wa2 26.基d1 響xb2 27.響xb2 @xb2 28.基b1 @f6 29. Exb3 Ec7 30. 6b4 e6, draw, Klovan-Dorfman, Erevan 1975; or 22 whl b3 23 wxa2 bxa2 24. #a1 #b7! 25 #xa2 #fb8 and according to an analysis by the Americans Silman and Donaldson, Black has reasonable play. 22 b3 23 We2 #fd82!

More accurate is 23... \$\pi\bar{7}! 24.40c4 e6 25. Qd4 星d8 26. Qxg7 Wa7+! 27. De3 星xd1 28. wxd1 如xg7, and although the endgame was slightly better for White, of course, Black could hold the draw. Hamarat-Ekebjaerg, correspondence game 1994.

24.0 fd5 e6

After 24... wxb2 25.6/xe7+ wb8 26 wxb2 axb2 27. ab1 the endgame is better for White. 25.@e7+ doh8 25... drf8 is no stronger: 26. Axd8+ Axd8

27. 2c6, with advantage for White.

26. 2d7



26... Eb7?

This fatally weakens the bottom rank. More stubborn is 26... \$\mu a8. but even then White is still hetter: 27.@d4! @xd4+ 28.Exd4 f6 29.@d2

\$27.30.906 Hack 31.60xf6! Hyc6.32.60b5+ gxh5 33.\dogs4g5+\dogs6f7 34.\dogsh5+\dogs6g7 35.\dogs6g5+ \$17 36. Exd8 ₩xb2+37. \$23, and Black resigned, Diani-Enricci, correspondence game 1996. This is also an attractive attack!

27 (De51

Now White wins by force. 27... If8

Besides 28. Exd8+. White was mainly threatening 28. 2xf7 mate.

28 @ vf7+! Anyway!

28... Exf7 29. Ed8+ Ef8 Or 29... £f8 30, £d4+, and mate.

30. \(xf8 + \(\hat{\pi} xf8 \) 31. \(\hat{\pi} d4 + \(\hat{\pi} a7 \) 32. \(\hat{\pi} e5! \) An elegant final move. Black resigned in view of 32...@xe5 33.@xe5 mate, or 32 草xe7 33.費b8+ and mate

SI 33.4

☐ Paylovic

■ Vogt

Zürichsee 2000

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 0c6 3.d4 cvd4 4.0vd4 g6 5.0c3 &g7 6.de3 0f6 7.dc4 0-0 8. 9h3 a5 9.0-012

A laconic reply!



9...421

Although a thematic move in the Uogele variation, this is slightly dubious in the present position. Safer, and probably not had, is 9...d6!?. A curious example is is Nataf-Pigusov. France 2000: 10.h3 @d7? (correct is 10...@xd4 11.@xd4 @d7) 11.@xf7+!, and a draw was agreed, although White is winning! 11... \$\psixf7\$ is met by 12. \$\infty\$ e6! \$\psixe6 13. \$\psid5+\$. and mate, and after 11... axf7 White plays 12.0e6 We8 13.0c7 Wd8 14.0xa8 @xc3 15.bxc3 b5 16.費d5 âb7 17かb6! かxb6 18. Wxb5, and wins.

10.@ xa4 @ xe4

Until recently, this position was assessed as good for Black, because he wins a central pawn by sacrificing an outside nawn 11.6\b5!

11. 2xc6?!, the old move, is less strong. 11... Xa6

11... Exa4 12. êxa4 êxb2 has also been tried. but this exchange sacrifice is not overly convincing.

12 We2 d6

Another idea is 12...d5, followed by ...e6, but then White can play #fd1 and c4.

13.c4 @f6

After 13...f5 White has the trick 14. &b6!. as 14... axb6? 15. axb6 曾xb6? loses the queen: 16.05+

14 h3 @f5

After 14... 2e6 15 #ad1 Wh8 16 @b6 White is also better, Nataf-Stanojoski, Batumi 1999. 15.Ead1

Thanks to the ferocious knight on b5, White is better

15... 2a5 16. Ife1 2xb3 17.axb3 2d7 18. ⊕ac3 Ie8 19. £g5 £c6 20.b4 Ia8 21.4 d4 wb6? This is a very bad place for the queen. Better

was 21... 2d7, when 22. 2xf6 2xf6 23. 2d5 @g7 24.@xe7+? won't work in view of 24 dbf8

22.b5 &d7 23. xf6! exf6

In order to keep at least the bishop: after 23... xf6 24. d5 \d8 25. xf6+ exf6 26. Wf3 White has a large advantage. 24.0d5 Wd8 25 Wd2



25...\was

25... &e6 26, €xe6 fxe6 27, €f4 is also had e.g. 27...4h6 28. Exe6! Exe6 29. @xe6. 26.₩xa5 Exa5 27.@b6 Ed8 28.@b3 Black resigned. He is totally lost, e.g.

28... Ia2 29. Ixd6 Ie8 30. Ixe8+ @xe8 31. \$\pi d8 \pi f8 32 \pi d5 \pi xh2 33 \pi c5

SI 33.5

□ Shianovsky

■ Gufeld Moscow 1966

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 @c6 5.c4 @f6 6.@c3 @xd4 7.₩xd4 q6 8 c5

This leads to tactical complications that Black need not fear. A good set-up is 8.2g5! âg7 9.響d2, e.g. 9...0-0 10.âd3 âe6 11.囂c1 ₩a5 12.0-0 a6 13.b3 #fc8 14.#fe1 with an excellent position for White.

8... g q7 9. g b5+ 9.cxd6 is met by 9...0-0!, e.g. 10.e5 @g4 11.2f4 exd6 12. wxd6 @xe5, with good play for Black

9... @ d7 10.cxd6

After 10.@xd7+ wxd7 11.cxd6 Black had an equal position after 11...0-0 12.2g5 @e8 13. Wb4 @xd6 Keres-Petrosian Willemstad Candidates' Tournament 1962

10...0-0 11 e52!

Too ambitious 11 dve72! Wve7 should also favour Black, but with 11.0-0 @xb5 12.@xb5 a6 13. 2c3 2e8 14. ₩b4 2xd6 White would still have had a playable position

11... 9 xb5 12. 9 xb5 0 d7 13 f42! White should have played 13.dxe7 wxe7 14.0-0, although Black is better after

14...@xe5. 13... #a5+ 14. 0c3 exd6 15. #xd6?

Here White throws away his last chance. He should in any case have castled. Now Black blows up the white position.



15... € xe5! 16.fxe5 @ xe5

Thanks to his lead in development and the unfortunate position of the white king, Black has more than enough compensation for the sacrificed piece. White looks lost in all variations

17. #d3 #ad8 18. #f3

After 18 @c2 Black wins with 18 @d4! 19 gd2 質fe8+ 20 cbd1 ge3! 21 質e1 wb5+! 22 doc1 #xd2

18 0 44!

Now, too, this move is extremely strong. The white king cannot castle and is completely at the mercy of the black rooks,

Or 19.2f4 #fe8+ 20.4rf1 g5 21.2d2 Wa6+ 22.4 e2 @xb2 23. ad1 @c3!, winning.

19... Efe8+ 20. ±f1 &xc3 21.bxc3 After 21. 要xc3 算d1+22. 中g2 要d5+ it is also curtains.

21...\bb b5+ 22.\dot f2

Or 22 中o2 草d3 23 響f6 響d5+ 24 中b3 草e6 25 曾fl 曾b5+

22 Td3 23 Wf6 Te2+! White resigned.

SI 33.7

☐ Mokry

Kallai Trnava 1985

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 0.c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4

q6 5.c4 @f6 6.@c3 d6 7.æe2 @xd4 8. wxd4 @ a7 9. @ a5

Another good move is 9.2e3. 9...0-0 10.\d2 a6

Black prepares the pawn sacrifice ... b5. After 10... e6 11. Ic1 Wa5 12.f3 Ifc8 13.b3 a6 14. 2a4 White's prospects are slightly better. 11.f3

11. acl may be followed by 11... e6 12.b3 Ec8 13.0-0 b5!? 14.cxb5 axb5 15.@xf6 (after 15.@xb5?! Black has the trick 15. Wa5 16.@d3 #xc3 17.#xc3 @xe4th 15 .@xf6 16.@xb5 Wb6, with counterplay for Black Gufeld-Konguyel, Calcutta 1994, and Chiburdanidze-Gufeld, Kuala Lumpur 1994.

11... e6 12. Ec1 Ec8

12...b5!? might well be better. After this move White can try 13 cxb5 axb5 14 b419-14...d5 15.@xf6 @xf6 16.exd5 @xc3 17.基xc3 響xd5 18.豐xd5 息xd5 19.a3 罩fc8 20.基xc8+ 基xc8 21.单d2, with slightly better play for White, Hellers-Piket, Thessaloniki Olympiad 1988.

13.b3



13...b5!? 14 cxb5 axb5 15 @xb5

15. axb5?! can be met strongly by 15... 響a5. White can go for the safe option by simply castling kingside: 15.0-0 b4 16.6 b5 ₩a5 17.ae3 2d7 18.2d4 2c5, with an approximately equal position, Szekely-Tangborn, Budapest 1992. 15... Exc1+ 16. Wxc1 Wa5+ 17. Wd2 ãa8! 18.a3

Returning the pawn. After 18.6 c3 Black has 18...h6 19.2e3 @g4: 20.2d4 2xd4 21. wxd4 皿c8 22. ゆd2 響g5+ 23. ゆc2 むe3+ 24. ゆb2 wxg225.量e1 要f226.要d2 d5, with good play. 21.2b1 @xb5 22.2xb5 2xa3 23.2b8+ @f8 24.@h6 @d7 25.Ed8 Ea1+ 26.@f2 Ea2

The game is balanced, although Black should still be careful. Fortunately he does not need to be afraid of axd7, since in that case he takes the hishon on h6

27.q4 f6?

An inaccuracy that could have had fatal consequences for Black. Correct is 27...g5! 28. axg5 f6 29. ah6 ahf7, and Black is definitely safe. 28. de 3?

White doesn't see it! He could have played 28.e5! here, with the point that Black loses his knight after 28...dxe5 29.@e3. After 28. fxe5 29.g5 IIa7 30.iic4+, or 28...g5 29.e6 it is also over. This trick was discovered by D.Strauss.

Draw

28... Ec2 29.

dd3

SI 33.9

☐ Furman ■ Spassky

Moscow 1957

1.913 c5 2.c4 a6 3.e4 @ a7 4.d4 cxd4 5.0 xd4 0 c6

Via transposition of moves we now find ourselves in the Accelerated Dragon.

6. 9 e3 ⊕h6

The most frequently played move is 6... 6.6. See the game Sikirin-Glushak.

7.40c3 0-0 8.8e2 f5 9.exf5 8xd4 10. @xd4?!

Now Black gets good chances. Stronger is 10. xh6! 基xf5 11.0-0, e.g. 11... Wb6!? (after 11...d6 12.\dd White is slightly better)

12.9 d5 @xf2+?! (better was the courageous 12...\wxb2!, with a very unclear position) 13. 本h1 wd4? (now things go definitely wrong) 14. g4! \wxd1 15.\maxd1 \mathbb{I}f7 16.\inftyxe7+! @xe7 17.@e6!, with winning play for White. Gurshevsky-Veresov, Moscow 1959. 10...@xf5 11.@c5

White has to move his bishop, as 11,2e3 @xe3 12.fxe3 Wb6 looks unpleasant.

11...d6 12. 9a3 @fd4 13.0-0 9f5 14 Tc1 14 @d3 e5 15 @e4 was another idea 14... 賞d7 15. 公d5 章f7

It is becoming clear where Black is going to strike: along the f-file!

16.b3 #af8 17. 9b2 e5! 18 b42!

Logical enough in itself. White wants to play b5 to undermine the position of @d4. But things are not that simple, as we will see. 18.f4 is less good as well in view of 18... £e6!, but 18. £e3! was an option, e.g. 21.₩e3, with an unclear position.

18... 9 e6! 19. 9 d3?

After 19.b5 Black would have played 19... axd5 20.cxd5 @xe2+ 21. wxe2 @e7. but that would have meant a lot less grief for White than what he is going to suffer now.

19...@q4! 20.f3

After 20. wd2 Black would have won with 20... kf3!, e.g. 21. De3 kxg2.



20... £xf3! 21.qxf3 @xf3+ 22. ±h1 22 草xf3 草xf3 23 草c2 變b3 24 草d2 e4 ie equally hopeless 22... wh3 23. If 2

Or 23.we2 @fd4 24.axf7 axf7 25.wd2 e4, and Black wins.

23...@e1!

White resigned.

SI 33 14

☐ Sikirin

■ Glushak

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0xd4 g6 5.c4 gg7 6.ge3 f6 7.fc3 gq4 Acting on the well-known principle that the player who is short of space must try to swap

8. wxq4 @xd4 9. wd1 e5 Alternatives are 9...@c6 and 9...@e6. 10.4 b5!? 0-0

Correspondence game 1999

10...@xb5 11.cxb5 d6 12.@c4 is good for White

11.Wd2

nieces.

After 11.@xd4?! exd4 12.@xd4 @a5+

13. 2e2 Ic8 Black gets good chances. But 11_&e2 is a reasonably playable move. A famous game with it is Gaprindashvili-Servaty. Dortmund 1974; 11... Wh4?! 12.6 xd4 exd4 13. axd4 wxe4 14. axg7 wxg2? (there was no better than 14... \$\preceq\$xg7 15.0-0, with advantage for White) 15.\dd! \dd! \dd! \dd xhl+ 16.\dd? \dd xal (16... 響c6 17.其e1 f6 18 息xf8 \$xf8 19 c5 and 16...wxh2 17.皇xf8 \$\dag{\pm}\$xf8 18.星e1 are hopeless as well) 17. \mathbb{\psi} f6!, and Black resigned. There is no cure against 18 & h6 and mate

11 Wh412

The sharpest move in this set-up. The alternative is 11... #e7, also with sharp play after 12.0-0-0 @xb5 13.cxb5 d5 14.exd5 #d8 15.d6 費e6 16,由bl 全f8 17,費c3!.

12. 9 d3 d5!



13.cxd5

After 13.exd5 Black has a good reply in 13... @h3!, e.g. 14.@xd4 (14.0-0 @xg2 15. dxg2 ₩g4+, with perpetual check) 14...exd4 15.gxh3 a6 16.@a3 &h6 17.\cdot\cdot\cdot Zae8+ 18. dd1 (18. de2? runs into 18...d3! 19. wxd3 星e3! 20. wdl 星fe8, with winning threats) 18...豐xh3 19.ae2 axe2 20.豐xe2 d3 21. 響e4 f5 22. 響e6+ 置f7, and White must go for perpetual check with 23. We8+ If8 24. we6+ If7 25. we8+, according to an old analysis by Boleslaysky. 13...@xb5 14.@xb5 @xe4 15.0-0 Ed8

16. Ifd1

After 16.d6 Black plays 16... 2d7. 16... @f8?!

Better moves are 16...\mathbb{#f5} and 16...\mathbb{2}d7. when Black can maintain the balance, albeit with some effort. For further finesses, please consult the theory books.

17.≅ac1 âb4

This was the idea, but White can simply sacrifice his d5 nawn

18. We2 Exd5 19. Ec4 Ed4 20. Edxd4! This is the refutation of Black's idea. 20. g xd4 費xe2 21. axc8+ axc8 22. g xe2 exd4 23. #xd4 #c1+ 24. @f1 @c5 25 #c4 on the other hand, would only lead to equality. 20...exd4 21. Exd4



21 Wh1+

After 21... We7 White wins with 22 @h61-and it's all over) 23.\\epsilone5! f6 24.\(\partial_c4+\pi_h8\) 25. wxe7 &xe7 26. Ze4, winning a piece.

22.草d1 響f5

Or 22... @xa2 23. ad8+ dog7 24. ad4+ f6 25. We8. winning. 23.¤d8+ sba7



24.q4! wb1+

After 24. #e6 25. @c4 We7 26 Wd3 also has a winning position 25.Ed1 wxa2 26.ad4+ f6 27.ac4 wa4

28.a5 Black resigned.

Rossolimo Variation

The Anti-Sicilian with 3. 9 h5

SI 31.4

☐ Bezold ■ Volkmann Austria 1999

3...e6 4. @ xc6

1.e4 c5 2.0 f3 @ c6 3. @ b5

White is prepared to give up the bishop pair in order to weaken the black pawn structure.

A principled move. White immediately lands Black with doubled pawns and condemns the c8 bishop to a passive role for now, Black should be very careful about when to push d7-d5, after which White blocks with c2-c4 and the c5 pawn becomes very weak.

4...bxc6 5.d3 @e7

A much-played manoeuvre, together with 26: Black wants to develop his kingside, and the knight on g6 is ideally placed, since it controls a number of important squares. The normal development with 2f6 and &e7 can be depended on to elicit e4-e5, after which the central pawns can be blocked with tempo. 6.h4 h5 7.we2 @g6 8.e5! f6

I was myself once confronted with this set-up. After a long think I decided to look for counterplay by sacrificing a pawn: 8... 2e7 9. We4! c4 10.dxc4 (after 10.\dagger xc4 Black regains the pawn with 10... 2xe5 11. 2xe5 Wa5+) 10 Th8 11. abd2 c5, and the c8 bishop is in the game again. But I still think that Black should look for an improvement at an earlier stage.

9. We4 &f7

Now the reason for inserting h4 and h5 becomes clear: the knight on g6 is not covered, so Black is forced into an unpleasant choice. After 9...f5 White has achieved exactly what he set out to do: to restrict all counterplay - if Black now wanted to attack pawn e5 with d7-d6, he would be left with an awful pair of doubled pawns. 10.Eh3! Wc7 11.@q5+!



The point of White's play. Already there is no escape.

11...fxq5 12.\(\frac{1}{2}f3+ \dig q8 13.\dig xq6 \dig xe5+ 14. cf1 gxh4 15. ag5 aa6 After 15... wxb2 White plays 16 wf7+ cb7

17. 響xh5+ 由g8 18. 響f7+ 由h7 19. 基h3, and mate on h4 can only be averted by a humiliating retreat of the queen.

16.0c3 c4 17.d4 \wxd4 18.\wf7+ \wh7 19. wxh5+ 如g8 20. wf7+ 如h7 21. 耳f6 ₩xf6 22 @xf6

Black resigns.

SI 31.4

☐ Ribeiro, Fernando

■ Kurajica

Zaragoza 1996

1.e4 c5 2.9 f3 @ c6 3 @ h5 e6

Black's main weapon against 3.2.b5, alongside 3...g6. Kurajica has an enormous amount of experience in the 3 ... e6 complex

4. xc6 bxc6 5.b3 d6

The idea is simple: Black wants to play e6-e5. after which the bishop on b2 has no active function for the moment

6. 9 b2

The big question is whether White can play 6.e5 here. In view of the fact that d6-d5 is not very attractive, accepting the pawn sacrifice is the only option: 6...dxe5 7. 2xe5 \dd. with a double attack. But this isn't the end of the story yet, as after 8.0c4 \mathbb{w}xa1 9.0c3 the queen is shut in on a1, and White calmly plays 0-0, followed by #f3 and 2a3. He wins the queen in return for two rooks

6...e5 7.0-0 f5

Actively played, Black attacks White's only centre pawn; after the swap he will have a colossal centre

8.exf5 @h6 9.Ee1 @e7 10.c3 @xf5 11.d4 e4 12.dxc5 Maybe White would have been better off stic-

king with the modest 12. 2 fd2. After 12...d5 13.f3 exf3 14.@xf3 0-0 the position is approximately equal.

12...0-0 13.0 d4 Wd7 14.cxd6 @xd6 15. 2 d2

Already White's position is less than ideal, as all black pieces are active. This makes it difficult for him to find a defence. After 15. we2, to cover the f2 square, Black plays 15...c5! 16. axf5 wxf5 17.h3 e3! 18.wxe3 (after 18.fxe3? We5 Black is already threatening mate) 18... ae8 19. ad2 (19. ae8 axf2+ 20. \$\psi h1 \ \mathbb{I} xe8 \ 21. \mathbb{I} xe8+ \psi f7. and Black

wins) 19... £f4 20. #d1 £g3!, and Black is

winning. White has simply not been given enough time to complete his development 15...@g4 16.h3 @h2+ 17.@f1 @xf2!



Now that the rook on the f-file is becoming actively involved, the game will be decided quickly.

18. \$\prix\$f2 e3+ 19. \$\pixe3 \$\pi\$c2+ 20. \$\pi\$f3 c5! 21.0xc2 @xd2+ 22.1e2 1xf3+ 23.qxf3

White resigns.

SI 31 5

☐ Miroshnichenko ■ Arzumanian

Alushta 2002

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 0c6 3.0b5 e6 4.0-0 @ge7 5.c3

If White doesn't want to give up his bishop at this early stage, this is the most frequently chosen option. White is aiming for a strong centre, and the set-up looks a lot like that of the Ruy Lopez.

5...a6 6. a4 b5 7. ac2 ab7 8 He1 Hc8

A move that doesn't sit well with the rest. 8...d5 is normal, when 9.e5 (9.exd5 @xd5 10.d4 cxd4 11.cxd4 leads to a well-known type of position in which White relies on an attack and Black blocks the isolated d-pawn with a view to capturing it later) 9...d4

10.ke4, and White has positioned his bishop correctly. But this manoeuvre has cost time, of course, and the position is equal.

9.a4!

White is creating weaknesses on the queenside; after 9.44 the point of Black's 8th move becomes clear: 9...cx44 10.cx44 20.41 1.26 x 2xc1 12.8 xc1 9.03 13.8 3 3 xc1 14.8 xc1, and a lot of White's attacking potential as evaporated. Both players have equal chances. 9. hd 10.46 hrs 31.1 df.

If White carelessly takes back on c3, Black has the same combination again: 11,bxc3 cxd4 12,cxd4 ©b4 13.2b3 2xc1.

11...cxb2?!

Developing White's bishop, after which Black's own f8 bishop finds itself cramped. For this reason it is safer to return the pawn at once with \$11...\(\theta\)by \$12.\(\theta\)xc3, and although White has a space advantage, Black has nothing much to worry about.

12. axb2 @b4 13. @bd2 @g6

It must have pained Black to decide not to capture a second pawn here. After 13_exd5 14_exd5 &xd5 he only has to play the bishop to 6 to enable him to continue developing normally. But 15_0e4! prevents this possibility, and Black won't be able to extricate himself, as winness: 15_k0e4 (after 15_k0e4 logher). End 6 fo.&23 €xc2? (16...&xe4 17_&xe4 leads to practically the same position as after taking on e4 at once) 17_Wxd5 €xd5 18_62f6+ it is mate) 16_&xe4 d5 17_k0f3 €xd5 18_62f6+ it is mate) 16_&xe4 d5 17_k0f3 €xd5 18_62f6+ it is mate) 16_&xe4 him will not find a way to safety.

14.40c4 d6

Black's best bet is 14...f6, but White is already so far ahead in development that I think he is better here.

15.a5! e5

After 15... \bigcirc xc2 16. \bigcirc xc2 e5 17. \bigcirc xd4+ \bigcirc d7 18. \bigcirc xd7+ \bigcirc xd7 19. \bigcirc b6+ \bigcirc xc7 20. \bigcirc xc8 \bigcirc xc8 White is already ahead in material, and following an assault along the b-file he will win the same.

16. âa4+ ¢e7



17.6 fxe5!

A nice final move. After 22... 變xe8 Black will be mated on g5, while 22... 變f6 23.量f3 變g6 24.量xf7+ 檢g8 25.量xf8+ 檢xf8 26.急xg6 will cost him hearth and home. Black resigns.

SI 31 7

☐ Finkel

■ Afek

Budapest 1992

1.e4 c5 2.ᡚf3 ᡚc6 3.âb5 g6 4.âxc6 bxc6 5.0-0 âg7 6.≣e1 ᡚf6

Giving White a simple and sound plan. These days, 6.—2ho is quite common, aiming for a "hedgehog" formation. Black plays 17-16, 2h6-17 and d7-d6. As White usually plays c2-c3 and d2-d4. Black 's pisces are idealty suited to repulse the advance c4-c5. It will also be pretty hard now to exchange Black's bishop. 7.e5 2/d5 8.c4 2c7 9.d4 cxd4 10,9xxd4

cxd5 14.4c3 &b7 15.Ead1

The result of the opening is quite visible now: White controls the centre and has attacking chances.

15...Ec8 16.@b5

A good possibility is 16.\(\hat{\omega}\)xg7 \(\hat{\omega}\)xg7 17.\(\hat{\omega}\)d4 \(\frac{1}{2}\)e4 18.\(\hat{\omega}\)cb5 \(\hat{\omega}\)xd4 19.\(\hat{\omega}\)xd4, and White is positionally better.

16...⊑c4 17.⊙bd4 ⊙xd4 18.⊙xd4 ≗xh6 19.∰xh6 ∰b6 20.⊙f3

White relinquishes square 44 and concentrates on the attack. Yet 20. \(^{\frac{1}{2}}\) d3 was better—the threat is mate on the h-file, of course, so that Black's next move is forced—and after 20. \(^{\frac{1}{2}}\) c88 21. \(^{\frac{1}{2}}\) d7 White keeps the better position.

20... Ec2 21. Ee3 f6 22.e6?

This was the time for Black to show his colours. After 22.exf6 響xf6 23.量e6! 響g7 24.豐e3 置xb2 25.量xe7 豐f6 26.h3 the position is approximately equal.

22... Ifc8 23.h4 Ic1 24. Ide1 d4 25.h5



White plays his last trump. Now Black even loses after 25...g5 26.@xg5, so the rest of the game is forced.

25...dxe3 26.hxg6 基xe1+ 27.彙h2 製d6+ 28.g3 基h1+! 29.彙xh1 皇xf3+ 30.彙h2

Reciprocal suggestion – the double blunder – is an interesting phenomenon during a chess game. I do not know exactly what the black

game. I do not know exactly what the black player overlooked, but the fact is that he is winning. Maybe he only looked at 30...hxg6 31.豐xg6+ \$\psi\$h8 32.\psi\$h6+, with perpetual check, but 30...豐xe6 winst There follows 31.豐xh7+ 空f8 32.g7+ 空e8 33.g8豐+ 豐xg8 34.豐xg8+ 宝d7 35.豐h7 e2 36.豐d3+ 空c7 37.豐c3+ 空b8, and Black runs to safety; the passed pawn and the mating threat on h8 are White's downfall

SI 31.7

☐ Grund
■ Renner

Bodensee 2000

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 ⊘c6 3.≗b5 g6 4.0-0 ≗g7 5.≣e1 e5

White is trying to build a broad centre by playing c2-c3 and d2-d4, and the text is intended to prevent this plan.

6.b4

An aggressive approach. The normal sequence is 6.8xc6 dxc6 7.d3, after which White continues with a2-a3 and b2-b4. After swapping on b4 White tries to prove that the half-open a-file and the black pawn on e5 make him slightly better.

6...cxb4

Taking with the knight is not advisable: 6... €xb4 7...£b2 f6 (7...a6 8.a3 axb5 9.axb4 xa1 10...£xa1, and White wins the pawn back with advantage) 8.c3 €c6 9.d4, and White gets a lot of compensation for the pawn.

7.a3 @ge7

Here, too, Black should proceed with care. After 7...bxa3 8.6xa3, for example, White's lead in development assumes threatening proportions, and he penetrates on square d6. 8.axb4 0-0 9.d3 d6 10.c3 h6 11.2c4 bf 712 wh3 f5

A position is reminiscent of the King's Indian: White is better on the queenside, while Black will have to pin his hopes on a king attack.

13. Dbd2 q5 14.01

After 14.b5 @a5 15. Wa3 b6 Black blocks the queenside for the time being.

14...f4 15.₩a2 @g6 16.b5 @ce7 17.≗a3 g4 18.@3d2 @h4 19.≗e6 @eg6 20.≌ed1



This looks slow. Taking on c8 first seems better to me. Black has quite a bit of potential on the kingside and now he strikes!

20...@xq2!! 21. exq2 @h4 22.f3? Not the best defence, but I also failed to come

up with an effective move myself, E.g. 22. £f5 wh3+23 wh1 (going to g1 to reserve square) hl for the queen was slightly more stubborn, but 23. \$\pmu_g 1 \otimes xf5 24.exf5 公h4 25. \$\pmu_d5 \otimes ae8 29.@xf3 gxf3 30.@g3 \ g6, and taking on g3 after 31... 2h5. and Black wins) 23... 2xf5 24.exf5 分h4 25.變d5 国ae8 (the threat is e5-e4) 26.2g3 fxg3 27.fxg3 e4 28.2g1 2xf5, and Black penetrates on f2 and wins, 22, \$21 axe6 23. 對xe6 f3 also wins. And after 22. 由h1 Wh3 23 &f5 &xf5 24 exf5 @h4 we find ourselves in a variation already mentioned.

22... Wh3+ 23. \$f2 &xe6

White resigns.

SI 31.8

☐ Barle ■ Jeric

Vrhnika 1995

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 @c6 3.@b5 g6 4.c3 a6? A harmless mistake? No, a capital error, not only because of the tempo wasted but more importantly because of the irreparable weakening of square b6. Now the queenside is weakened to such an extent that Black cannot prevent the white pieces from penetrating, The normal moves are 4... 66 or 4... 27.

5. 9 xc6 dxc6 6.d3 9 g7 7.0-0 e5 8.9 e3 ₩e7 9.h4!

Exploiting the weaknesses on the queenside. The pawn sacrifice opens the files and White also conquers square c5, after which Black will find it hard to castle.

9...cxb4 10.cxb4 @xb4 11.6 bd2 &e6 12. Th1 We7 13. Wc2 f6

Awaiting developments with 13... ad8 is no ontion either. After 14. #fd1 #d7 15. @b3 axb3 16. axb3 White doubles on the b-file, and if Black plays b7-b5, the pawn on c6 will fall. After 13... 6h6 White can win the pawn back again with 14 @xe5 @xe5 15, @xh6, and he keeps the better position.

14 9 c5 Wf7 15 d4!

The threat is taking on e5, playing @g5 and then taking on e6, after which b7 is unprotected. 15...exd4 16.9 xd4 0-0-0



This covers the b7 pawn alright, but White's attack has built up too much steam by now. 17.0xc6 bxc6 18.\alpha a4 0e7 19.\alpha xe7 ₩xe7 20,₩xc6+ ₩c7 21,₩xe6+ Ed7 22 Efc1

Black resigns.

SI 31 9

☐ Romero Holmes

Soto Perez

Malaga 1998

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 9f6 3.9c3 9c6 4.9b5 2d4 5.e5 4xb5 6.4xb5 4d5 7.4g5



This picturesque knight move, first played in Zaitsey-Syeshnikov (1980) has caused Black enormous headaches and is. I believe, the reason why 3... 66 is hardly played against the Rossolimo these days. If you check the database you will find an enormous number of miniatures

7 h6?

This is certainly not the solution. The fact that White is threatening 8.#f3, severely limits Black's options: 7...f6 and 7...f5 are his best bets. The road is strewn with pitfalls. 7...\(\Delta\)c7?, for example already loses a pawn 11. 分xc7+ 實xc7 12. 質xf6 And after 7 e6? square d6 is unmercifully exploited with 8.42e4.

8 @xf7!2

Here 8.6)e4 has shown itself to be a very promising alternative.

8... \$xf7 9. \$\psif3+ \$\psie6

This is asking a lot from the black position. Better is 9... 2f6 10.exf6 exf6 11. 費d5+ \$26 12.0-0 wb6 13.wd3+ 如行 14.基e1 wc6 15.@c3 c4 16.We4, as in Graf-Gisbrecht. German championship, Saarbrücken 2002. The position looks equal, but after the blunder 16. @c522 17 @xc4+ Black resigned

10.c4 @b6 11 d4 d5 After 11...cxd4 12.@xd4+ @xe5 13.@f4+

Black is already mated. 12.dxc5 @xc4 13.@d4+ @d7 14.e6+

c7 15. 2f4+



Black didn't have the stomach to play on, and it is true that after 15. @d6 16 #c1! \$\phi b8 17. wb3 we8 18.cxd6 exd6 19. cc6+ there is very little hope for him indeed.

191 190

Alapin Variation

The Anti-Sicilian with 2.c3

SI 46.4

☐ Vlacenv ■ Martin

Passau 1993

1.e4 c5 2.c3 d5

It goes without saying that Black is not going to take the formation of a strong centre with d4 lying down.

6.⊕f3 e5 7.⊕c3 âb4 8.âd2 âxc3 9. 9xc3 e4 10. 0e5 0xe5 11, dxe5 0e7 12.\mad+!?

One of the many possibilities White has here. 12....âd7



13.₩b4

13 \#a3 has also been tried here. An example: 13... 響e6 14. êe2 0-0 15.0-0 全g6 16. afd1 Øf4 17.2f1 ₩g6 (Black settles for a draw;

17 . a.c6!? looks strong) 18. axd7 @h3+ 19.\$h1 @xf2+ 20.\$g1 @h3+, and a draw, Howell-Gallagher England 1984.

13 a5 14 Wa3

And here the moves 14 wd6 and 14 wb6 have also been played.

14...\@e6 15.\\d1

15 \psic519 was a good alternative, according

to Vlassov 15 b5?

Too ambitious! Better is 15 0-0! 16. #d6 (or 16. #d6 &c6) 16... #f5 17. &c2 &c6 18.0-0 6/06, and Black was fine in Khachatrian-Mshedlishvili, Erevan 1996.

16. #d6 Wf5

16 h4 17 @xh4 ₩xe5 18 @c3 doesn't look good for Black either.

17.q4! ₩xq4

17...實f3 is met by 18. [xd7! 含xd7 19 @xb5+, and White wins.



18 e6l fye6

18... êxe6 is followed by 19. êxb5+ \$f8 20.₩xa5! Дxa5 21.Дd8. mate! After 18.... ac6 things are not so simple, but 19. wc5 looks very strong: 19... ac8 20. axb5 axb5 21 響xh5+ 中f8 22 響d7 耳e8 23 exf7 響xd7 24.\pixd7 \pixf7 25.\pig1, or 19...e3 20.\pie2 ₩g2 21.exf7+ \(\phi\)xf7 22.\(\pm\)f1, in both cases with a large advantage for White.

19. #xd7! \$xd7 20. \$xb5+

Now things go very fast. At this stage, Black probably regretted not having castled on move 15 here!

20...@c6 21. ke5! ∏ac8

Or 21...耳hc8 22.響d6+ 会e8 23.&xc6+ 会f7 24 @xa8 耳cl+ 25 少d2 耳xh1 26 單d7+ and it's curtains

Txc6 24 wyc6+ obf7 25 wd7+

Black resigned.

SI 46.5

☐ Ekström ■ Dumitrache

Erevan Olympiad 1996

1.e4 c5 2.c3 d5 3.exd5 @xd5 4.d4 @f6 5.6 f3 @ q4 6. Wa4+

For 6. 2bd2, see Votava-Lutz, 6. 2e2 is also an ontion. 6...Øc6

6... âd7 7. 實h3 cxd4 8. âc4 實e4+ 9. 由f1 e6 10.cxd4 (10.のbd2 響c6 11.のxd4 響c7 12.6/2f3 のc6 13.0b5 賞b8 14.ae2 a6 also leads to equality) 10...\(\overline{\phi}\)c6 11.\(\overline{\phi}\)c3 \(\overline{\pm}\)f5 12. 實xb7 以b8 13. 實c7 ae7 leads to a complicated position with roughly equal prospects for both players.

7. ac4 wd7

After 7 We4+8 @e3 @xf3 9 Ød2 Black has the tactical trick 9... ad1, but 10. axd1 wxg2 11. \$e2 cxd4 12.cxd4 e6 13. 4 f3 vielded White good compensation for the pawn in Stevic-Kurajica, Vinkovci 1995.

8.dxc5 @xf3 9.axf3 \forall f5?!

A dubious idea! 9...e6 10. e3 4 d5 11. exd5 wxd5 12. we4 is also good for White, but 9...g6!? may be Black's best bet: 10.2e32g7 11. 2 d2 0-0 12.0-0-0 \@h3, with unclear play. Teitsson-Petursson, Revkjavik 1995.

10 9e3 e62

This is beautifully refuted, but after 10... wxf3 11. ag1, followed by 12. 20d2, White has a considerable lead in develon-

11. @ a6! Wxf3 There is nothing else.

12. axb7 wxh1+ 13. e2 ed7



14 Ø d2!

Always nice, such a double rook sacrifice! Black will not survive the white attack.

14...₩xa1

14. Wd5 is met by 15.c4. 15. 9 xc6+ Фe7

Or 15... \$c8 16.\#a6+ \$d8 17.\#a5+ \$c8 18. £f4. and Black might as well resign. 16. axa8 ₩xb2 17. ₩xa7+ ad8

Or 17...@d7 18.c6.

18.c6 @d6

After 18 Wxc3 Black will be mated soon: 19 å h6+ \$e8 20 實h8+ \$e7 21 質d8

19 wyf7 wb5+?!

More stubborn was 19... 耳f8, although 20. 實b7 wxb7 21.cxb7, followed by the advance of the a-pawn, won't leave Black much hope.

20. e1 #e5 21. f1 &c5 Otherwise 22. &b6+ decides.

22.公f3 賞c7 23.公q5 含c8 24.全b7+?! With 24 @f4 White could have finished it at 24 bh8 25 wxc7+

Black resigned. After 25...\psixc7 26.6\xe6+ \$\d627.\$\timesxc5 he is left with a hopeless position.

SI 46.5

☐ Votava

Intz

Erevan Olympiad 1996

1.e4 c5 2.c3 d5 3.exd5 wxd5 4.d4 @f6 5.2f3 & a4 6.2bd2 2c6 7.&c4 &xf3 8.axf3

The move 8. #a4? runs into the surprisingly strong 8... 2d1!. After 8. Wb3 Black has 8...@a5, e.g. 9.\(\hat{x}\)xd5 \(\Delta\)xb3 \(10.\Delta\)xf3 \(\Delta\)xd5 11.axb3 cxd4 12.@xd4 e5, with approximate equality, Shiroy-J.Polgar, Dos Hermanas 1997

8...\forall f5! 9.\forall b3

This double attack on b7 and f7 looks scary, but Black easily solves the problem.



9...0-0-0 10.@xf7 @d5! 11.@xd5 Exd5 12.9 e4?! Not a good idea. The game Shaked-De Firmi-

Thus Chandler

7 0c4 Wd8

an. US championship 1996, saw 12. Ig1 e6 13. \$\pi_9\$ cxd4 14. \$\Pi_e4 \\ \text{\tint{\text{\tiliex{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\ti}\ti}\tint{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\tint{\text{ Black would have had a good position after 15...dxc3! 16. €xc3 IIhd8.

12...e6 13.@q3

13.4xc5? is very bad: 13...4xc5 14.dxc5

13...\#xf3

The white opening strategy has utterly failed. 14. 9 e3 cxd4 15. 9 xd4

After 15.cxd4 Black has the unpleasant

15 @h4+ 15... ad6! 16. #d1 #a2 17. #a4 @xd4! 17... @xg3?! is not clear after 18.0-0-0!, e.g. 18... 公xd4 19.cxd4 實xf2 20.賣xe6+ 買d7

21.hxg3, and White has counterplay, according to Lutz

Thf8

It is all over.

21. dd3 db8

Vacating square c8 for the rook. 22. ac1 af3+ 23. c4 ad2

White resigned; after 24. acd1 ac8+ 25. ab5 □h3+! 26 axh3 Wc6 he is mated

SI 46.6

☐ Schmittdiel

Ernst. Thomas

Gausdal 1987 1.e4 c5 2.c3 d5 3.exd5 @xd5 4.d4 e6 5.9 f3 9 f6 6.9 bd2

Other possibilities are 6.4a3, 6.4e3 and

6 0 02 6...Øc6

To prevent White from making the manoeuvre @d2-b3xd4 Black could have played 6...cxd4!? here, e.g. 7.2c4 Wd8 8.2xd4 a6 9.0-0 2d6, with a roughly equal position.

After 7... #h5 8.2e2! cxd4 9.0xd4 #d5

10.@xc6 wxc6 11.0-0 White has slightly more pleasant play, Ochoa-Van der Sterren. Thessaloniki Olympiad 1984.

8.6\b3

White can also play 8.dxc5 &xc5 9.0-0 0-0 10. 6b3 here, and he is slightly better.

8...cxd4 9. 0bxd4 @xd4 10. 0xd4 &e7 In a later game Schmittdiel-Bönsch, Altensteig 1991, Black played 10... #c7: after 11. We2 a6 12.a4 ae7 13.0-0 0-0 14.ag5 2d5 15.@xe7 @xe7 16.f4 @d7 17 @d3 @f5

the position was roughly equal. 11. We2 0-0 12.0-0 ad7

Black has an awkward position. Now 12... 12... 12...
12...
13.公b5. 13. @f4 a6 14 II ad1



This move not only serves to trouble \delta d8 but it also sends the rook on its way to h3! 14... #a5 15. #fe1 #fe8 16. e5! #ad8 17. Ed3 ⊈c8 18. Eh3 Ød7?

This is refuted, but a better move is hard to find. White was threatening 19, 2d3 to force a weakening of the castled position. 19. Wh5 @f8

After 19...h6 White plays 20.b4 #b6 21. 2xe7, and wins.

20.€ f5! Now the knight gets involved as well!

20...₩c5

20...exf5? is impossible, of course, in view of

21. Wxf7+ 必h8 22 Wg8 mate 21.b4l Wxc4



22. Wh6! Wa4

Black could also have allowed the nice mate 22...gxh6 23.@xh6. What he tries now also leads to mate.

₩xq7 26. Exg7+ &h8 27. Eq4 Mate.

SI 46 9

☐ Malanink ■ Gorelov Saratov 1981

1.e4 c5 2.c3 d5 3.exd5 \widetilde xd5 4.d4 e6 5.@f3 @f6 6.@d3 @e7 7.0-0 cxd4

With the text Black hopes to increase the pressure on the white d4-pawn, because after a few moves he can play ... Id8. On the other hand, White can try to thwart his plans with 6b5, of course. Black can also retreat with 9... #d8, transposing to positions known from the Oueen's Gambit

10. û a5 After 10.0b5 @d8 11.2f4 0d5 12.2e3 0-0

13. Icl a6 14. Oc3 another Queen's Gam-

bit-like position arises, albeit with a none too common bishop on g3. 10...0-0 11 Ec1 Ed8

Now White must do something about his pawn on d4. He goes for a tactical solution. 12.0b5 @d7 13.0e5! 0xe5 14.IIc7 ₩d5 15.dxe5



15...₩xe5!

15... ₩xd3? is bad in view of 16. ₩xd3 ¤xd3 17. Exe7 &d7 18. 40d6, and White wins, e.g. 18...&c6 19.&xf6 gxf6 20.4xf7. 16.基xe7 管xq5 17.全xh7+

And White wins the exchange... 17...\$xh7 18.\(\po\)xd8 \(\omega\)d7!

The point of Black's play. He gives another exchange.

19.₩xa8 &xb5 20.q3

White allows perpetual check. After the riskylooking 20. Ed1 Black doesn't seem to have much more than a perpetual either: 20...2c6 21.g3 \psig4 22.\psid8 \Od5 (after 22...\psif3? White swaps queens with 23. #d3+!) 23. #c1

21 doxf1 mc1+22 doe2 mc2+ Black also has at least perpetual check. 20... axf1 21. axf1 營c1+ 22. ag2 營c6+ Drawn in view of perpetual check 23.\pi1 #c1+ 24. \$\psi_2 \psi_c6+. 23. \$\psi_h3? is bad in view of 23... #f3, with the threat of 24... 2g4.

SI 47 9

☐ Chiburdanidze

■ Andreeva

Thilliei 1973

1.e4 c5 2.c3 @f6 3.e5 @d5 4.d4 cxd4 5.cxd4 d6 6.@f3 @c6 7.@c3 @xc3

This is not really an inferior move, but Black's easiest option is 7. dxe5 8.dxe5 @xc3 9.\xxd8+ @xd8 10.bxc3 &d7 with

equality. 8.bxc3 dxe5?!

But this is dubious! Safer and stronger are 8...e6. 8... wa5 and 8...d5.



Now we see the difference with 7...dxe5! White does not have to take back on e5. 9...e4

9... 4b8 10. 4xe5 is no better,

10.4\a5

10.dxc6 is also an idea: 10... wxd1+11. wxd1 exf3 12. ab5 ad8 13. af4 ag4 (13...e5!? may be a better move) 14.cxb7 fxg2+ 15.\$\psi_c2\$ gxh1 # 16. #xh1 #c8 17. \$a6 e5 18. \$xe5 \$c5.19.bxc8∰+ \$xc8, and now instead of 20.国d1+?! \$e7 21.毫xg7 耳g8 22.毫xc8 Exg7, with an equal endgame, Montgomery-Rawley, US 1992, White plays the stronger 20. \$\partial x \text{g7} \quad \quad \quad \text{g8} \quad 21. \$\partial \text{f6} + \partial \text{c7} \quad 22. \$\partial \text{e5} + \partial \text{c6} \quad \text{6}

23. 2d3, with a better endgame for White. 10... ae5 11. axe4 ₩c7

11...g6 12.d6!f5 13.\d5 \one2g7 14.\one2h6!\one2xh6 15. ₩xe5 If8 16.d7+! turned out to be no improvement, and Black resigned. Tamburro-Russett, correspondence game 1988.

12. #d4 @d7 13. @a3 With the threat of 14 d6

13...f6 14.d6 ₩c6 Or 14...exd6 15.@xd6+, with advantage for

15.dxe7 皇xe7 16.皇xe7 会xe7 17.蒙b4+

Black is trying a trick based on the pin on @e4, but unfortunately it won't wash. Black should have played 18 ... 2g4, although the result doesn't look too solid either: 19.0d6+ \$26 20.\$d3+ f5 21 0-0

19.fxe5 Ixe5 20.0-0-0! Ixe4 21.Ixd7+ The simple refutation

21... De8 22 Te7+1

Black resigned in view of 22... #xe7 23. &b5.

SI 47.10

☐ Sveshnikov ■ Rashkovsky

Sochi 1976

1.e4 c5 2.c3 @f6 3.e5 @d5 4.d4 cxd4 5.6 f3 @c6 6.cxd4 d6 7. @c4 e6 For 7... 6b6, see the game Pavasovic-Jelen.

8.0-0 ≜e7 9.₩e2 0-0 10.公c3 公xc3 11.bxc3 d5?!

This is less good on principle, as Black robs himself of counterplay. After the stronger 11...dxe5 12.dxe5 \(\vec{w}_c7\) 13.\(\vec{a}_d3\)\(\vec{a}_d7\) 14\(\vec{w}_{c4}\) 26 chances would be about equal.

12. ad3 @a5?!

Too slow; 12... d7 or 12...f5 13.exf6 e.p. @xf6 may be better possibilities.



13.h4! @xh4

Should Black take the pawn? After 13... 2d7 White attacks with 14.0g5. After the text White will direct his attack along the h-file. 14.g3 @e7 15. g2 f6 16.exf6 @xf6

No stronger is 16...gxf6 in view of 17.2h1 If7 (or 17...f5 18.@e5) 18.@e5! fxe5 19.毫xh7+! 草xh7 20.草xh7 \$\psi_xh7 21 \$\psi_h5_+\$ \$g8 22.\$g6+ \$h8 23.\$a3.

17. Xh1 a6

17...h6 is also met by 18.42e5. 18.4\e5 @xe5

After 18... ad7? White wins with 19 Exh7! êxe5 20.dxe5 @xh7 21.響h5+

19.dxe5 重f7 20. ₩g4 @c6

20... Ig7 is of course met by 21. Qh6. 21. £xg6!?

White strikes. He could also have opted for a

more staid approach with 21. @f419 21...hxq6 22.\mathbb{\mathbb{w}}xg6+ \mathbb{\mathbb{q}}q7 23.\mathbb{\mathbb{w}}h5 \mathbb{\mathbb{w}}f8?

23...\$d7!? 24.8h6! (after 24.8a3 West 25. Wh8+ &f7 26. Wh5+ White has no more than perpetual check) 24... #e8 (after 24... 2e8? 27. Wh8) 25. axg7 Wxh5 26. Exh5 如xg7 27. Hah1 offers better prospects. The position looks good for White, but Black can still put up a fight. After the text he succumbs quickly. 24. Ih4 ⊕e7 25. 9 a3!

Black resigned in view of 25...@d7 26. Wh8+

由f7 27 耳f4+

SI 47 11

☐ Pavasovic
■ Jelen

Ljubljana 1997

1.e4 c5 2.c3 ②f6 3.e5 ②d5 4.d4 cxd4 5.②f3 ②c6 6.cxd4 d6 7.业c4 ②b6 8.业b3

White can also play 8.2b5.

8...dxe5

A safe alternative is 8...e6, e.g. 9.兔g5 兔e7 10.兔xe7 ②xe7 11.蠼e2 dxe5 12.dxe5 兔d7, with approximate equality, V.Ivanov-Kravtsov, Moscow 1995.

9.d5!? \$\alpha\$ 10.\$\alpha\$ 3 \times 3 \times 3 11.\$\box\$ xb3 11.\$\box\$ xb3 e6

After 11...g6 12.\$\alpha\$ xc5 \$\alpha\$ g7 13.\$\alpha\$ 14 0-0

14.\$\box\$ ald 1 White also has the slightly more pleasant position

12.6 xe5 exd5

After 12. "Exxf. 13. WES+ &dT 14. Wxb7 Wc8 15. Wxc8+ Exx6 16. £xd7 &xd7 17. £xxf5 exd5 18. &c5 the endgame favours White, but 14... £xf2 the endgame favours White, but 14... £xf2 the endgame favours White, but improvement for Black. The point is 15. £xxf7 Wc8!, and Black has good play, Vlassov-Kargin, Moscow 1999. According to Gallagher, White's best reply may be 15.0-0!?.

13. e3 ed6 14. ₩b5+ cf8!?



 axb6 19.\(\bar{\pi}\)xd5 \(\phi\)c6 (thus far V.Ivanov-Kriventsov, Moscow 1994), and now 20.\(\bar{\pi}\)hd1!, White is slightly better. Thus Chandler.

15.0-0-0!? âe6

The piece sacrifice is correct, as witness: $5.8 \pm 8.5^{\circ}$ [1.6 &...545, and no N.6...2477 | 17.804+4 &828 | 8.8.1bcl, winning, or 16...2667 | 17.804-6 &866 | 8.8.1bcl, winning, or 16...266 | 19.8.2bcl &867 | 20.8.2dc | 864+2 | 1.5cal | 2.6cal | 2.2cal | 8.8.2cal | 5.8.2cal | 5.8.2cal

Good for Black is 16.f4 &xe5 17.fxe5 h6
18.h4 &g8 19.&b1 #c7 20.&xb6 #xb6
21.#yxb6 axb6 22.@xd5 #a5, Van der
Werf-Van Wely. Wijk aan Zee 1995.

16 Ec8 17 &b1 @c412

Black can also go 17...重c6, as 18.公d4 can be met by 18...重c4; but the text is sharper.

18. ○xd5 a6 19. 圖b3



19...₩a5

Now the game will be liquidated to an equal position.

After the game the computer Fritz indicated 19...\$\(\overline{15}\)+ 20.\$\overline{19}\)aligned 22.\$\overline{19}\)table x67 (21.\$\overline{19}\)x67 (22.\$\overline{19}\)x67 (22.\$\overline{19}\)x67 (21.\$\overline{19}\)x67 (

is highly unclear - does White have compensation for the exchange?

20.ஓb6 ⊕xb6 21.₩xb6 ₩xb6 22.⊕xb6 ≣c6 23.⊕d5

Draw

SI 47 15

☐ Finkel

■ Maryasin

1.e4 c5 2.c3 @f6 3.e5 @d5 4.@f3 @c6 5.@c4 @b6 6.@b3 g6 7.d4 cxd4 8.cxd4 @g7 9.d5!?

An interesting pawn sacrifice. For 9. €c3, see the game Rozentalis-Bologan.

9...@xe5 10.@xe5 @xe5 11.@h6



11...e6

After II... &xb2 12.642, 12... &xa1?! is risy: 13 wxa1 fo 14.66! e6 15.024 dx7 16.g4 0.45 17.g5 b5 13.&xd5 exd5 19.62xf6, with advantage for White, according to Finkel's analysis. But 12... dx 613.db 18.23 (after 13...&c5 or 13...&f6 the position is also unclean 14.0-0 &xd2 15.wxd2 f6 16 wf4 0.47 17.&a4 dx7 leads to an unclear position, Weiss-Valenzuela, Chilean championship 1998. Does White have compensation for the two pawns? Instead of the text, Black could also try 11...d6.

12.0c3 Wh4 13.Wd2 0c4?

There is nothing else.

18.a3! ≗xc3

After 18... #xb3 Finkel has indicated the following winning line: 19-0xe4 &cr 20.06 &28 (20... &ds 21.#ed4) 21.0-0; xxh6 22.#ed4 Ig8 23.6/fe+ &f8 24.6xh7+ &ce8 25.#ef6 &f8 26.#eg5 &xd6 27.4/fe+ &f8 28.#ef6+ Ig7 29.#h8+ &cr 30.#eg7 &c5+ 31.Exc5i bxc5 32.6/g8+ &ds6 33.#e65+ &c6 34.6xf+ &f8 5.#ef6 &f8 36 da4. Requiriful.

19. Ixc3 響e4+ 20. Ie3! 響b1+ 21. 由f2 響f5

Or 21...豐xhl 22.豐d4! 耳g8 23.豐f6 豐d1 24.皇g5 堂f8 25.豐e7+ 堂g7 26.皇f6+ 堂h6 27.罝h3+, and it's all over.

22. \$\mathreve{\pi}\$ c3 \$\mathreve{\pi}\$ g4 24. \$\tilde{\pi}\$ g5 f5 24...(6 won't work either: 25. \$\mathreve{\pi}\$ xc6+! dxe6 26. \$\mathreve{\pi}\$ xf6.

Black resigned.

SI 47.15

☐ Rozentalis ■ Bologan

Relfort 1994

1.e4 c5 2.c3 @f6 3.e5 @d5 4.@f3 @c6 5.@c4 @b6 6.@b3 q6

Good alternatives are 6...d6 and 6...c4. **7.d4 cxd4 8.cxd4 2g7 9.**€c3 For 9.d5!?, see the game Finkel-Maryasin. **9...0-0 10.h4?!**

This move is probably too ambitious, but af-

ter simply 10.0-0 d6 11.exd6 響xd6 Black has

good play.

10...d5! 11.h5 2g4 12.hxg6

But maybe 12. £e2!? is a good option, when 12...gxh5?! is met by 13. £g3 and 12....£xh5?! is met by the exchange sacrifice 13. £kh5; according to Bologan, 12...f6! is the correct reply.

12...fxq6 13.@e3

13.草xh7 looks nice, but after 13...≜xf3 14.草xg7+ ⇔xg7 15.gxf3 e6, followed by 16...豐h4, Black is better.

13...a5 14.a3 14.a4 is met by 14...@b4.

14...e6 15.₩e2 a4 16.ûc2

After 16. 2a2 Black plays 16... 2a5, followed by ... 2b3 or ... 2ac4.

16...@c4! 17.@d3

White is in trouble, as 17. €xxa4? costs material in view of 17... ≣xa4 18. £xa4 #8.5+, and 17. £xa4 is met strongly by 17... #b6t, e.g. 18.0-0-0 ≣x31 !9.gx3 £xf3 20. #c2 £xh1 21. Æxh1 €xxd4, or 18. £b1 £xxh3 19.gxf3 €xxd4, with advantage to Black.

After 17.0-0-0 Black immediately attacks the

white castled position with 17...b5!, according to Bologan.

17...b5 18.0 xb5 \#a5+ 19.0 c3



19...9 4xe5!

A devastating knight sacrifice! 20.dxe5 @xe5 21. @d2

21... 트xf3! 22.gxf3 总xf3 23. 豐f1 总xh1 24.0-0-0 总f3 25. 트e1 公xd3+ 26. 豐xd3 总g4

White resigned. A model execution!

Various Systems

SI 1 4

☐ Dvoretsky ■ Pobla

Viliandi 1972

1.e4 c5 2.4 f3 d6 3. 9 b5+

This bishop check is known as the Moscow variation.

3...⊕d7

The correct way to generate tension in the position. 3...€x6 transposes to the Rossolimo variation.

4.d4 cxd4

4... of6 is more common here. White replies 5. oc3 or 5.0-0, a pawn sacrifice.

5.≝xd4 ⊕f6 6.≗g5 e6

With the bishop on g5 the push e7-e5 cannot be recommended.

7.9 c3 &e7 8.0-0-0

White prins all his hopes on building up a lead in development. 8.e5 dxe5 9.£xe5 turns out to be premature in view of the cool 9..0-01 (9...he½) 10.£xf6 £xf6 11.0-0-0 0-0 12.£xd7 falls to equalise) 10.£xd7 and now the improbable 10..£xd7 11.£xf6 £xf6 12.∰xd7 ₩56. White can't save his piece, e.g. 13.£a4 ∰36.±14.c3 afo or 13.0-0-0 £xc3 14.bxc3 且ad8 15.∰c7 且xd1 + 16.£xd1 ₩36. 17.且d8 ₩11+18.æb2 ½-52 Palciauskas-Maeder, cr 19.54

8.&xf6 gxf6 9.&xd7+&xd7 10.0-0 (Christiansen-Kreiman, Philadelphia 1999) also turned out to be premature after 10...b5! 11.&b1 a5! 12.\(\frac{1}{2}\) 15.\(\frac{1}{2}\) 5.\(\frac{1}{2}\) 6.\(\frac{1}{2}\) 5.\(\frac{1}{2}\) 6.\(\frac{1}

8...0-0 9.\textbf{#he1}

Again it is too early for direct action, although the game Xu Vulua-Zhao Xue, HeiBei 2001, gives a different picture. After 9.2xd 7.xd7 10.e5 dxe5 11.6xe5 2xe8? 12.wih4! win6 (12...045 13.xx7 wc7 14.wc7 6xc7 15.6d7 2xd7 16.Exd7 isn't much good either) 13...Id 31 (13.xx6 4 2xxe1 44.xxe7 6xd2 15.0c41) 13...Id89; 14.Eh3! the youthful black player already had to resign. The white attack is unstoppable. After 11...x6cf, on the other hand, Black has little to fear.

9...@c5 10.e5 dxe5 11.\hbb h4 looks more dang-

erous for Black. An important question is whether White can play 10.\(\text{\pm}xd7\) \(\text{\pm}xd7\) 11.\(\text{\pm}xf6\) gxf6 f (2.e5, as in the game, after the more modest 9...\(\text{\pm}C7\).

10.@xd7 @xd7 11.@xf6 axf6

11...\(\hat{\text{\text{x}}}\)f6 12.e5 \(\hat{\text{\xi}\text{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi\text{\text{\text{\texi}\tint{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texit{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\tex



13 IIfd8 14 @xd7

Despite a long think, Dvoretsky failed to find the decisive combination. After 14:26457; dxc51 15:2xx7+ ±2R3 16:39/d6 ±2b51, Black surprisingly bolds. 14:39/g4+ 54R8 15:25x47+ 32A7 16:3d5 also looks promising (16.2xd57) 7.73/g4x7 3z61 18.3db1 d4 19/s0551), but Black has 16...39/b61, e.g. 17.3xx67/ 2x62 18.39/c64 19.32f5+427/20.217+ 54b8. You need a player like Tal to find the death blow. He discovered 14:39/g4+1! ±4R, and now the devastating 15:2xx7! ±5x7 16.3d51; cutting off the fifth rank. After 16.3d51; cutting off the fifth rank. After

14... xd7 15. 2e4

White's best bet, as neither 15.基d3 饗g5+ 16.站b1 饗f6 nor 15.基e3 皇g5 16.f4 e5 17.基xe5 饗xe5 18.饗xe5 dxe5 19.基xd7 全xf4+ strikes home.

15...h6?!

With 15... ₩xa2! Black could have put White on the spot.

16.≣e3 ⊈h7 17.≣f3! ≣f8 18.⊈b1 b6 19.₩e3 ⊈g5?

The decisive error. After 19...\\$\text{#h5!} Black's disadvantage remains manageable.

20.₩d3 f5 21.@xg5+ hxg5 22.ℤh3+ \$\psig7\$

22... 由g6 23. We2!, and White penetrates on h5. 23. We3! f4 24. Wxe6 製f5 25. Wh6+ 由f7 26. 耳xd6

Black resigned.

Sixteen years later, Saint John 1988, Dooretsky again faced the diagrammed position, this time against the Norwegian player Scholseth, who went for 13...&c6, which allows White an attack that is as good as winning after 14.6xx6 bxc6 15.5d3. But Dvoretsky slipped up big time by playing 14.d33?7 at once, thinking that 14...dxc5 15.5xc6 would finish the game. That is true enough, except that it would finish it for Black, as White suddenly has no good moves left after 15...#b41

SI 1.9

□ Karaklajic ■ Nikolic, Stanimir

Pristina 1973

1.e4 c5 2.∅f3 d6 3.Ձb5+ Ձd7 4.Ձxd7+ ₩xd7

4...\@xd7 is an alternative played repeatedly by Kasparov. It leads to less drawish positions.

5.c4

Intending to assume the Maroczy central position with 5...@c6 6.d4 cxd4 7.@xd4. White has a pleasant space advantage.

5...₩g4?

An unwarranted attempt to exploit 5.c.4. In the game Stean-Geller, Moscow 1975, Black launched the queen sortie a move later; 5...206.6.4. Wig4 7.d.5 Wix4+ 8.&.23 20.44 9.Wa4+ 15.40 Wig4 7.d.5 Wix4+ 8.&.23 20.44 9.Wa4+ 15.Wix47 II.3.d.2 Wix41 II.

6.0-0 ₩xe4 7.d4 ②c6?

This makes for a quick finish, but 7...cxd4 isn't everything either. In Hort-Rajkovic, Sarajevo 1972, there followd 8.\(\Delta\)xd4 \(\Delta\)f6 9.\(\Delta\)c3 \(\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \

8.0c3 Wg4 9.0b5 Wd7 10.dxc5 dxc5 11.2f4 0-0-0

After 11... wxdl 12. axdl, 13. c7+, winning the exchange, cannot be parried.

12.曾a4 曾f5 13.皇g3 a6 14.星ad1 显xd1 Both here and on the next move, ②b5 was untouchable, of course, in view of 15.曾a8+, and mate

15.⊒xd1

Threatening 16. 2a7!+ 2xa7 17. ₩e8 mate.

15...@f6



16. wa5!

A nice final move! Black can choose between 16... 4xa5 17. 4a7 mate, and 16... 4c8 17. 4d8 18. 4a7 mate. So he resigned.

SI 1.9

☐ Magomedov

■ Isaev

Dushanbe 1999

1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 d6 3.ଛb5+ ଛd7 4.ଛxd7+ ₩xd7 5.c4 ⊕c6 6.⊕c3 g6 7.d4 ଛg7

After 7...cxd4 8.\(\times \) xd4 \(\times \) g7 9.\(\times \) e3 \(\times \) f6 10.f3 White is slightly better because of his space advantage. Whether the text is a better plan is doubtful, however.

8.d5 @xc3+?!

This was the idea behind 7... £g7: the white pawn formation is weakened. A slightly dubious idea – Black cannot really do without his king's bishop.

9.bxc3 @a5 10.@d2 e5 11.0-0!

In Ponomariov-Bologan, Belfort 1998, 11.dxe6?! 響xe6 12.響a4+ 公c6 13.重b1 0-0-0 14.0-0 ②gc7 turned out to be good for Black. 11...公e7

 blevsky-Martinovic, Vrnjacka Banja 1999.

12.f4! exf4 13. Ixf4 g5?!

Here 13...0-0 was not an attractive option, although probably better than the clumsy plan Black is attempting now.

14.Ef6 @q6



15.e5!

This more or less refutes Black's idea. The white knight will cause Black no end of trouble from square e4.

15. ve5.

15...dxe5 16.42e4 should also be very good for White.

16.@e4 @axc4 17.≣e6+!

17.草xd6 黉c7 18.黉a4+ 兔f8 19.草h6! was pretty good as well, but the text is probably White's strongest option.

17...¢f8

After 17...fxe6 White wins the queen with 18.⊕f6+, while 17...\$d8 18.\$xg5+ \$\phi c8\$ 19.\$\phi xd6+ \$\phi xd6 20.\$\pm xe5\$ is also very good for White.

18.₩f1 h6 19.h4 dg7 20.hxg5! fxe6 Black asks for proof. After 20...hxg5. by the

way, 21.實f6+ 会g8 22.豐xg5+ 会f8 23.全f6 would have won for White.

Or 21...\$g6 22.\$\psif6+ \$\psih7 23.dxe6 \$\psic7 24.\$\psif5+.

22.皇xh6+ sxh6 23.實f6+ sh7

23... 全g6 is met by 24. 由f2, threatening

25. Ibl., mate. 24. With 41 dr 97 25. Ibl. 11 Ibl. 8 After 25... Wids 26.616 Wihs 27. Wig5+ Black is also finished. 25. Wix16+ dr 98. Or 27... shr 28. dr 68 vive6 90. 27. shr 28. dr 68 vive6 90. Ibl. 28. dr 68 vive6 90. dr 68 vive6

33. Ig3
And Black resigned.

SI 2.2

☐ Yermolinsky ■ Shabalov

US championship, Long Beach 1993

1.e4 c5 2. ②f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4. ₩xd4 This is called the Hungarian variation. 4...a6

Preparing for &c6. Black wants to chase the dominant queen from d4.

5.≗e3 ∕∂c6

Everything according to plan. Another idea is 5....@d7, on the one hand to watch square b6 and on the other to prepare for the central advance 7...e5 after 6...@d ...@gf6 7.0.0-0. The move 7...e5 is powerless to prevent this plan in view of 7...dx6 8...@xe5 9...we5 9..

6. ₩d2 @f6 7. @c3 e6 8.0-0-0 b5?!

Moving pawns when you're behind in development is asking for trouble. The same goes for queen moves. A gruesome example is 8... 10.0 moves of the same possible of the same possi

9.e5! dxe5 10.₩xd8+ @xd8 11.@xb5!

The queen swap has only exacerbated Black's problems. There is an almost total cake of defenders, so White strikes. The alternative sacrifice 11.\(\text{\omega}\)xb5 b looks promising after 11.\(\text{\omega}\)xb5 \(\text{\omega}\) b \(\text{\omega}\) b \(\text{\omega}\) c \(\text{\omega}\) b \(\text{\ome

13. Exd5 exd5 14. De7+ \$\psi \cong 15. \Omega x8 d d 16. \Omega d \chi \text{L} \text{Def}\$ but Black has something better. He returns a pawn with 11. \Omega d 71 2. \Omega x7 d \chi \text{L} \text{M} \cong d \text{L} \text{S} \text{C} \text{T} \text{L} \text{L} \text{C} \text{T} \text{L} \text{L} \text{C} \text{T} \text{L} \text{L} \text{E} \text{E}

Involve more pieces is the motto. 14. \(\Delta\)xe5 \(\Delta\)d6
15.\(\Delta\)xd7 \(\Delta\)5 are premature.
14. \(\Delta\)5

In Fieandt-Hartikainen, Helsinki 1995, it turned out that Black cannot afford to play 14. "Exa2. 15. Exd.7 Bal.+ 16. &dz.2 &bd++ 17.c3 Ha5 18. &b6! 0-0 19. &xa5 &xa5 20. &xe5, and the threat of 21. &xe4 forced Black to resign. The bishoo is lost.

15. ≗xd7+ ∞e7 16. ≗b6

16.c4!? is an attempt to get more than a simple endgame. Whether that will work after 16...e4 17.\(\Delta\)d2 \(\max_{24} = 18.\(\Delta\)b1 \(\max_{25} \)b2 \(\Delta\)x64+ \(\Delta\)c8 is the big question, according to Yermolinsky.

16... #d5 17. #xd5 exd5 18.4 xe5



A remarkable endgame. White has two pawns and a strong bishop pair for an exchange. Moreover, the black pieces are reduced to passivity for the moment, while an attempt to win a piece with 18...f6?? fails to 19.2c5 mater.

18...**⊘e6!**

An improvement compared to Dolmatov-Yermoliasky, Moscow 1977, where Black failed to stop the pawns after 18...\$\psi d6\$ 19.\particle xd8 \psi xe5 20.\particle b6 \psi d6 21.\particle b5.

19.âb5 g6 20.a4 âg7 21.⊘c6+ d6 22.a5 Ic8 23.⊘a7 Ia8 24.âa4?

Giving away the advantage that he could have kept with 24.c3 (&dd must be prevented. After 24...&f6125.£c6 IC8, 26.a6!? is worth a try: 26...Ix66 27.a7 IE8 (27...IX66 28.a8 W IX65 29.Waf4 &wc5 30.b4+ loses) 28.&a6 IC8 29.&b7. 26...d4!? looks like a better way to save himself.

24... 0c5! 25. 0b5+ c6 26. 0d4++

After 26.⊕c7+?! ⊕xa4 27.⊕xa8 ≜xb2+ White should be the one to watch out; hence his flight into perpetual check.

26...\$d6 27.∆b5+ \$c6 28.∆a7++ \$d6

SI 2 6

☐ Magomedov

■ Nazarov

Dushanbe 1999
1.e4 c5 2.⊕f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.₩xd4
⊕c6

This gives Black the bishop pair. White's compensation is his lead in development and the super-fast deployment of his pieces. 5.\(\text{\pm} \)5.\(\text{\pm} \)5 \(\text{\pm} \)6 \(\text{\pm} \)7 6.\(\text{\pm} \)xc6 \(\text{\pm} \)xc6 \(\text{\pm} \)7 10.\(\text{\pm} \)d3 \(\text{\pm} \)6 8.\(\text{\pm} \)9 6 9.0-0-0 \(\text{\pm} \)e7 10.\(\text{\pm} \)d3

The most common move is 10. Ehe1. See the games Grottke-Kalinichenko and Vasiukov-Van Welv

10...♥a5 11.âd2 ₩c7 12.@d4 a6 13.f4 b5

The variation White has opted for offers roughly equal chances. White has possibilities on the kingside, Black on the queenside, in other words, a typical Sicilian. Instead of the text, 13...0-0-0 should also be quite playable.

14.e5 dxe5 15.fxe5 @d7 16.@xc6

Another possibility is 16.£/4 &b7 17.#g3, after which Topalov had suggested 17...0-01?; after 18.£h6 g6 19.£x/8 &x/8 Black's two bishops give him compensation for the exchange. Besides, pawn e5 is weak. 16...#x/66 17.#g/a/36

Maybe Black could just have allowed the capture on g7. Both 17...b4!? 18.豐xg7 單f8 19.心b1 黨c8 and 17...單c8!? 18.豐xg7 單f8 19.豐xh7 b4 look promising for him.

18. 25 2xq5+ 19. ₩xq5 b4 20. Id6

The earlier game Kasimdzhanov-Topalov, Wijk and Zee 1999, saw 20. €e2 ₹e8 21. €e4 ₩e4 22. ₹eb1 0-0, with an approximately equal position. The text quickly leads to success, but it is quite doubtful whether it is really stronger than 20. €e2.

20...₩c4?

The correct reply was 20...₩c5!, when 21.0d5 exd5 22.e6 is not possible because 且6 is hanging. 21.0c4 ₩xc5 22.₩h4 g5! 23.₩e1 0c5! Also favours Black, and 21.Exd7 bxc3!? 22.Ed3 cxb2+23.deb1 Inc8 Magomedov's analyses. The text is refuted.



21. 2d5! exd5 22.e6 0-0

Other moves also lose: 22...£c5 23.exf7+ \$\pi\forall 24\text{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\text{\tex 28. #e7. Again according to Magomedov. 23.exd7 Zad8 24.Zd1 We2 25.Wxd5 And Black resigned

SI 2.8

☐ Grottke ■ Kalinichev

Potedam 1986

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.0b5+ 0.c6 4 d4 cxd4 5. #xd4 &d7 6. &xc6 &xc6 7. 0 c3 @f6 8.&q5 e6 9.0-0-0 &e7 10.The1 0-0 11 職 42

For 11. b1, see the game Vasiukov-Van Welv.

11... wc7 12.のd4 b5!?

A nawn sacrifice; but in the Sicilian neither White nor Black would balk at this. An example with 12... #fd8 is Yusupov-Psakhis Moscow 1981: 13.f4 h6 14.h4 b5 15. Ie3 (after 15.0 cxb5 @xb5 16.0 xb5 Wc4 Black bas compensation) 15...b4 16.2xf6 2xf6 17.@ce2 a5 18. Ih1 h5, with unclear play. 13.0 xc6

After 13. 2 dxb5 2xb5 14. 0xb5 @c4 15.0c3 Zab8 Black has excellent compensation for the pawn.

13... ₩xc6 14. 2xf6 2xf6 15. ₩xd6 ₩c4 Now Black should also have good compensation for his pawn. 16.₩d3

After 16.e5 Black could have played 16... 其fd8 17. 實a6 實f4+ 18 \$b1 \$xe5 16... #c5!? 17. #xb5?!

A better move is 17.f4. In Yandemirov-Ruck. Budapest 1993, there followed 17... ## Ifd8 18.響f3!? (after 18.響xb5?! axd1+ 19.\$xd1 Id8+ 20.\$c1 響f2 Black has good play) 18...b4 19.@a4 聯c6 20.b3 @c3 21 單e3 axd1+ 22. wxd1, and White eventually managed to win, although the position is still difficult enough, Instead of 20,...&c3, 20,...e5!? 21.f5 Hac8 22.Hxd8+ @xd8 and 20...Hac8!? 21.基xd8+ 拿xd8 22.實d3 拿c7 seem stronger options, and in both cases Black still has enough compensation for the sacrificed pawn.

17... wxf2 18.e5 □ab8 19.we2 Or 19.響a5 全g5+ 20.事b1 全d2, with very

good play for Black 19...\#f4+ 20.\\$b1?!

Relatively better was 20. 響e3 êxe5 21. 響xf4 @xf4+ 22.@b1 @xh2, although White has little to look forward to. After the text Black plans a tactical strike.



20... Exb2+! 21. da1

After 21. \$\pmuxb2\$ Black plays 21... \$\pmub4+\$ 22. \$c1 &g5+, and wins. 21...@h4 22.\@e4?

This loses at once, but 22.g3 \bar{w}b4 23.\bar{w}d3 Ib8 24. Wd4 Wxd4 25. Ixd4 Ixc2 was equally hopeless.

22...@xe1! 23.\xf4 \@xc3 24.\xfg3 ≣h3±

And White resigned.

SI 2.9

☐ Vasinkov

■ Van Welv Moscow 2002

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.\ xd4 @c6 5.&b5 &d7 6.&xc6 &xc6 7.@c3 @f6 8.âq5 e6 9.0-0-0 âe7 10.∏he1 0-0

A better move may be 11... #c7, as in Grottke-Kalinichev. An example is Zahariev-Rogers, Agios Nikolaos 1995: 12. 軍d2 耳fc8 13 のd4 b5 14.@xc6 (14.@cxb5?! &xb5 15.@xb5 ₩c5 is very promising for Black, e.g. 16. axf6 axf6 17. axd6 ab8, Kallai-Perenvi. Kecskemet 1981; after 14.f3 b4 15.6/ce2 a5 Black also has counterplay) 14... wxc6 15. axf6 axf6 16. wxd6 axc3 17. wxc6 Exc6 18.bxc3 Exc3 19.Ed7 g5, with an equal endgame.

12. Wd2 Wa6

White was already threatening 13. 2d5. After 12... ₩b6 13. ©d4. 12... Ifc8 13. ©d4 and 12... Ifd8 13. 2d4 White is also slightly better, as the theory books will tell you. 13.4 d4 Ifc8 14.f4 h6

Because this is not really attacking the bishop, 14...b5!? may be a better option.



15.h4!

After 15.@h4? Black could have played 15... axe4!. The text is more or less a standard sacrifice. It is unlikely that Black will survive the white attack along the h-file after 15...hxg5? 16.hxg5 @d7 17.2h1

15...\mathbb{\psi} c4?!

15...b5!? is probably better. In Gipslis- R.Sutkus, correspondence game 1996. Black was far from bad after 16. 當d3 實b7! 17.e5 dxe5 18.fxe5 hxg5 19.exf6 @xf6 20.hxg5 @xg5.

16.q4 \$f8

Maybe Black should still have played 16...b5!?. 17.f5! hxq5

So Black captures anyway! Other moves are no better: 17...e5 18.@xf6 @xf6 19.6/f3 followed by 20.g5, with a winning attack, or 17.... d7 18. axh6 gxh6 19. wxh6+ 如g8 20.fxe6 fxe6 21.If1 If8 22.g5.

18.hxq5 @d7 19.fxe6 @e5 20.\h*1

After 20. #h2!, the move indicated by the German grandmaster Kindermann White also has a winning attack

20...fxe6

Black is lost in all variations: 20...g621. Ah8+ 中g7 22.其h7+! 由xh7 23.實h2+ 中g8 24.其h1: 20... \$\psie e8 21.\$\pi h8 + \$\pi f8 22.e7 \$\pi xe7 23.\$\pi f5 +: 20...@e6 21.\dfl! &e8 22.\d5 &xo5 23. 實xg5 實xd4 24. 實e7+! 公xe7 25. 耳h8+ @g8 26.e7 mate!

21.b3! #b4 22.2h8+ &f7 23. #f4+ &f6 Or 23... \$26 24. 2xe6.

After 24... wxc3 White wins with 25. xf6+, while 24...@xg4 is met by 25.gxf6 @xf6 26.e5 dxe5 27. \$\mu xg7+! \Psi xg7 28. \Oxe6+.

25.gxf6! \$\psi\n7 26.\psi\q5! \$\pm\$c7 27.\$\Omega\xe6! ■ac8 28.fxq7 \$\dot q8 29.\mathbb{\mathbb{I}}\text{h1} \$\oldsymbol{\text{.xe4}}\text{} 30. Ih8+ &f7 31. 2xc7 ₩xc3 32.q8₩+ And Black resigned.

SI 32.1

☐ Adams

■ Knezevic

France 1997

1.e4 c5 2.413 4c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.4xd4

Not a very obvious move. One of the ideas behind it is castling queenside and marching the pawns down the kingside. Black will be under pressure. For 7.2d3, see the next two games. 7....@b4

Black can also go for other moves here, such as 7... #c7 or 7...d6. An example is 7... #c7 8.g4 h6 9. 2g2 a6 10.f4 d6 11. 2d2 2e7 12.h4, with a good position for White, Mikh.Tseitlin-Avshalumov, Balatonbereny 1989.

8. @d2 0-0 9.a3 @xc3

After 9...\$e7 10.e5 @d5 11 @xd5 exd5 12.0-0-0 d6 13 exd6 @xd6 14 @c3 White is slightly better.

10. 9 xc3 e5

Otherwise White takes on f6. 11.0-0-0 IId8

Black can also play 11... #e8, e.g. 12.g4!? d5! 13.exd5 &xg4 14.f3 @d4! 15.@xd4 exd4 16.全xd4 曾d6 17.實f2 曾f4+ 18.其d2 全xf3. with a complicated position, Sorokin-Karasev, Blagoveschensk 1988.

11... De8!? is another option: Black continues with 12...d6 and 13...&e6.

12.Xd6!

Exceptionally strong! In view of the pinned £06, the main threat is 13. £a5. There is no cure against the exchange sacrifice on f6.



12...\@c7

12...6\d4? fails to 13.\(\mathbb{Z}\)xd4 exd4 14.\(\hat{\alpha}\)a5. while 12... €e8? fials to 13. 2a5 @a6 14.實xa6 bxa6 15.其xc6.

13. Exf6! gxf6 14. wg4+ sh8 15. wh4 **₩d6**

15... \$27 is met by 16. \$\overline{a}\$d2 實d6 17. 實h6+ **堂g8 18.** 童g5! 響f8 19. 響xf6 響g7 20. 響xg7+ \$xg7 21.\$xd8, with a winning position. Black's most stubborn defence is 15. d61? Niiboer-Piket Amsterdam 2001 continued as follows: 16. wxf6+ 会g8 17. wg5+ 会h8 18.f4 @e7 19. @xe7 @xe7 20.fxe5 dxe5 21. @xe5+ @g8 22. @f6. White had good play for the exchange, but in the end Black managed to escane with a draw.

16.f4!

White has magnificent play for the sacrificed exchange. Black is probably already lost. 16... ge7 17. gb5! Ze8

Is there anything better? After 17...d5? 18. axc6 bxc6 19. axe5 it is over, and also after 17...d6? 18.@xc6_bxc6_19.fxe5_dxe5 20. ab4 實e6 21. ac5 響e7 22. ab7, According to Adams, 17... \$\mu g8!? is better, in order to play 19... #g6 after 18. @xc6 dxc6 19. @xe5. But after 20. adl Black's position is pretty dire.

18.\d1 d6 19.\a5 &d7 Or 19... @xa5 20. @xe8 實xe8 21. 實xf6+ 查g8 22. and Black might as well resign. 20.@xb7 @d4

What else?

21.\(\mathbb{Z}\)xd4! \(\omega\)xb5

Or 21...exd4 22.\(\hat{L}\)xd4 \(\delta\)g7 23.\(\hat{L}\)xd7 \(\bar{L}\)eb8 24. 實g5+ 空f8 25. 皇xf6 實xd7 26. 實g7+ 空e8 27. **愛**g8 mate!

22.9 xd6 exd4 23. 9 xd4

The black position has been shot to pieces. The rest needs no comment.

23... #xd6 24. 2xf6+ #xf6 25. #xf6+ #g8 26.₩g5+ #f8 27.₩xb5 Exe4 28. Wc5+ 中内8 29.b4 h6 30. Wc6 其e1+

\$f8 34.₩c5+

Black resigned.

SI 32 1

☐ Nadanian

■ Palevich

Correspondence game 1993

1.e4 c5 2.9f3 @c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 8. e3 @c7 9.0-0 e7 10.f4 d6 11 @f3

The usual attacking set-up by White in this line

11...0-0 12.Xae1 b5 13.e5!?

The sharpest continuation. For the much played alternative 13.g4, see the game Ulibin-Akopian. 13. #g3 and 13. #h3 have also been tried. An example with the latter move is Paven-Wauters, Cannes 1989: 13...e5 14.f5 ©b4 15.g4 d5 16.g5 @xe4? (16...d4! is the critical move with an unclear position) 17.6)xd5 6)xd5 18 6xe4 6)xe3 19 ffxe3 axg5 20.耳g3! af6 21.響g2 響a7+ 22.由h1 耳b8 23.耳xg7+! 中h8 24.耳xh7+! 中xh7 25. #h3+, and Black resigned.

13...@d7

Less good is 13...dxe5?! 14.fxe5, and now Black has to play 14... 2d7, after which 15.2f4! 2b7 16. ₩g3 is good for White, as 14...@xe5? 15.\\xixa8 @eg4 16.e3 \&b7 17. #a7 #c6 fails to 18. ke4! @xe4 19. @a5. and White wins. Thus an analysis by Nadanian. But 13... @e8!? is a good alternative. 14.exd6

14. Wh3!? was also worth considering. 14...\@xd6

After 14 @xd6? White has 15 @xb5! axb5 16.6\xb5, and White wins material. 15 @a512

15. @e4! is also very good: 15... #c7 16. #h5 g6 17. Wh6, with good attacking chances.

15...@xa5

This is forced, as 15...@db8? in impossible in view of 16. ae4 ad7 17. ad1 實c7 18. axd7!. 16. ₩xa8 âb7

Other moves are weaker, 16...@c6? is met by 17. ge4 while after 16 b42! 17 Ge4 響で 18 響a7 gb7 19 gf21 響c6 20 響e31 のc5 (after 20...f5 White can escape with 21.\\hat{w}h3!) 21. Wh3 axd3 22.cxd3 White is better, again according to Nadanian's analysis.

17. 資a7 b4! 18. 其d1!

After both 18 @b5? and 18 @e4? Black has 18... 賞c6 19.草c2 f5 20. 全g5 草a8 21.賞d4 ⊕c5 and wins

18...₩c7!

Bad is 18...bxc3? 19.@xh7+ @xh7 20 #xd6 êxd6 21.響d4! êc5 22.響d3+ 会g8 23.êxc5 ©xc5 24 ₩xc3 and White wins

19. @ xa6! IIa8

Now 19...bxc3 was definitely a possibility, although White is marginally better after 20. @xb7 @xb7 21.b3 or 21.bxc31? Again according to Nadanian

20.0 b5



20...\\xc2!

Threatening mate on g2! Other queen moves are not good: 20...\colon c6? fails to 21.\(\hat{a}xb7.\) while 20... #d8? is met by 21. #d4. e.g. 24.@xb7 @cxb7 25.b3 #c8 26.c3! bxc3 27. ac1, and White has a winning endgame. 21.Ad2

23 Exd7 @c5+ 24 @xc5 @xc5+ 25 @d4 f6 the position is approximately equal, according to Palevich. 21... Xxa7

21... \wxd2? is bad in view of 22 \wxa8+ but 21...響f5!? or 21...豐g6!? could have been a nossibility

22. Axc2 Axa6 23. Ad1 466 24. Ac7 468 Here a draw was agreed. The position, incidentally, is still not entirely clear.

Instead of the text 24. \$182 would have been had as White then has the trick

25 Exe71 doxe7 26 &c5+ doe8 27 &c7+

SI 32.1

Ulibin Akopian

Soviet Union 1986

1.e4 c5 2.013 0 c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.0 xd4 8.0-0 a6 9.2e3 @c7 10.f4 d6 11.@f3 0-0 12. Zae1 b5 13.q4 &b7 14.q5 @d7



15.₩h3

15. This probably more dangerous for Black - If1-f3-h3 is looming! See the game Ulibin-Kiroy (SI 39.16) for the same manoeuvre 15...@b4 16.f5 exf5 17.exf5 @xd3

18.cxd3 #ae8 19.@d4

The aggressive 19.f6? gxf6 20.gxf6 &xf6 21.基xf6 公xf6 22.實g3+ gh8 23.gd4 yields nothing: 23... [xe1+ 24. 實xe1 [208+ 25 余f] Ig6. The other pawn move, 19.g6, leads to perpetual check after 19...hxg6 20.fxg6 fxg6 21. we6+ 由h7 22. wh3+, but maybe Black can try 19...@f6!?.

19... ú d8

On its way to the b6-g1 diagonal! And Ze8 is activated as well.

20.a3

After 20.g6 hxg6 21.fxg6 fxg6 22.@e6 Black has 22... 基xf1+23. 基xf1 變c6, with good play. 20...@e5 21.f6 axf6 22.axf6 \$\text{\$\text{\$h8!}} 23.2h6 ₩c5

Even 23... \$\pig8+ 24.\hat{\pi}g7+ \$\pixg7+ 25.fxg7+\$ \$xg7 was worth considering; after 26. Ee3, followed by 27.40ce2, the position is unclear. according to Akopian.

24. gq7+ gq8 25. ge2

White definitely has to cover the knight first. 25...#d5! 26.4/f5

26.@xf8? won't work in view of 26. Wh1+ 27. 由f2 公xd3+ 28.由g3 (28.曾xd3 曾g2 mate) 28 #e3+

26...@q4!

Now 26... 對h1+? 27.如f2 公xd3+ was not good: after 28.\$23 White simply wins. 27.@h6+

Other moves are bad: 27. #xg4? #h1+ 28. \$\psi f2 \psi xh2+, and mate; 27. \Deg3? \&b6+. and White wins, 27. 2fg3 &b6+ also wins for White

27...@xh6 28.@xh6 @b6+ 29.d4 @xd4+ 30. 0 xd4 @xd4+ 31. 2 e3 @d3 After 31... We4? 32 If4! it is curtains

32. #g3+ #g6 33. h6 Exe1 34. Exe1 #c8 35 #e7 35 #c1 is safer

35 945

Maybe Black could still have tried 35. &f3 with the intention of 36 ... 294.

Draw

SI 43 1

☐ De Vrengt Schuurman

Amsterdam 2001

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 a6

The Hyper-Accelerated Dragon offers both players all kinds of possibilities to experiment.

3.d4 cxd4 4.\(\psi\)xd4

A deviation that makes the play even sharper. 4. axd4 would have transposed to the 'normal' Dragon after 4...@c6.

Here White can choose between three moves. With the usual 5.0c3 0c6 6. ₩a4 d6 7.e5! he tries to open the centre.

Bronstein has indicated the unusual 5 @b5 a6!? (after 5... #a5+?!, 6. #c3! is extremely annoying, because c8 is hanging. An example in which things went wrong very quickly is Fette-Legahn, Krumbach 1991: 6...@c6 7. #xa5 @xa5 8. @c3 a6 9.e5 @g4 10. @d5 dd8 11.h3 @h6 12.&e3 1-0. The intention of the bishon move becomes clear after 5 @c6 6.2xc6 dxc6 7. wxd8+ dxd8 8. 2c3. although this is certainly playable for Black) 6.e5 axb5 7.exf6 &c6, and the white queen is chased out of the centre after all

The text chases the black king's knight away. 5.... 2c6 6. ₩f4

6. #a4 @d5 7. #b3 (7. #e4 transposes to the game) 7...@b6 8.&f4 is another idea. Black lost against it after 8... 2g7 9.4c3 0-0 10.0-0-0 d5?! 11.exd6 e.p. e5?! (11... e6 12.響a3) 12.皇g5 響e8 13.至e4!? 皇e6 14. mb5 f6 15. de3 mf7? (here 15 dya2 is Black's last chance) 16. fg5! fxg5 17. fxg5 @d4 18. \(\partial xd4 \) \(\partial d7 \) 19. \(\partial xf7 \) \(\partial xb5 \) 20. \(\partial xe5 \) 1-0 Rogers-Schuurman, Hoogeveen 2002 6... 2d5 7. we4 2db4

The game Trenchard-Blackburne, Vienna 1898, (7...@c78.@c3 &g79, &c4 b5!) indicates how old this system already is.

8.a3

Provocation. White usually chooses between the developing moves 8. kb5 and 8 @a3 d5 (8...d6 9. âb5!) 9. 響f4 息g7 10. âd2 響b6 11.c3 @a6 12.@b5 0-0. 8...d5! 9.\e2

9.exd6? e.p. &f5 ends in tears for White. 9...₩a5?

A huge error. Black should have played 9...@a6 10.b4 @c7 11.@b2 @g7. 10 c3! a6

10... @a6 11.b4 @axb4 (after 11... ₩c7 12.b5

Black also loses a piece) 12.cxb4 @xb4 13. wb5+ wxb5 14. axb5+ 公c6. Black has insufficient compensation for the piece.



11.cxb4?

White allows himself to be drawn into an unclear adventure. Only with the subtle backtracking move 11. #d1! af5 12.cxb4 @xb4 13. ad2 e6 14. d4 would be have maintained his winning advantage

11...@xb4 12.@c3 &f5 13.@d4 @d3+ 14.0d1 @xc12

Black misses his chance. After 14... #b6 15. 2e3 @xb2+ 16. 2d2 @c4+ White would be well advised to allow move repetition (17, 20d1 ②b2), as 17. \$\preceq\$c1? \$\preceq\$c8 goes wrong. Better is 15. 2xf5! 2xf2+ 16. del 2xh1 17. 9xd5 ₩a5+ 18.₩d2, and White is still superior.

15. We3! This puts paid to Black's counterplay. 15... #c5 16. #xc1 @h6 17.f4 Black resigned.

SI 43.1

☐ Aronin ■ Kantarovich

Moscow 1960

1.e4 c5 2.4 f3 q6 3.c3 b6?!

An early queen fianchetto in the Sicilian is generally not a good idea. A good possibility is 3... 66, or 3... 27 4.d4 exd4 5.cxd4 d5, when 6.exd5 @f6 transposes to the Caro-Kann. Panov variation. White can also try 6.e5.

4 d4 9 b7 5 9 c4 d52!

This is asking too much, 5,...@xe4?! is also too dangerous in view of 6.2xf7+ 2xf7 7. 2g5+, but 5... 2g7 is still playable.

6.exd5 @xd5? Consistent but fatal, Black's only hope was

6 @f6 7.\\a4+! \&c6

Or 7...@c6 8.@e5 #c8 9.@b5. and White. wins material.



8 Ce51

And Black resigned, wa4 is untouchable in view of mate on f7, while 8... #c7 is met by 9 @\xc6 @\xc6 10 d5

SI 43.3

☐ Nunn

Surtees

Basingstoke 1977 1.e4 c5 2.4 f3 a6

O'Kelly's move. 3.c4

The point of 2...a6 is that 3.d4 cxd4 4. 2xd4 is met by 4...@f6 5.@c3 e5, followed by 6... 2b4. White need not really fear this line. but with the text he avoids it altogether. 3...@c6

With 3...e6 Black can allow transposition to

the Kan variation with 4 d4 cxd4 5 @xd4 4.d4 cxd4 5.0 xd4 0.f6 6.0 c3 e5 7.Øf512 d5 8.cxd5 @xf5 9.exf5 @d4

All this is known, but Black's variation does not have a good name.

11... û b4

10 @d3 @xd5 11 0-0

11...@xc3? is certainly less good; 12.bxc3 夕c6 13 買b1 響d7 14 響f3 âe7 15 âe4 0a0 (or 15 #c8 16 f6! @xf6 17 @f5) 16 f6! @xf6 17. Exb7!, and Black resigned, Zapletal-Bakos, correspondence game 1968, as after 17...響xb7 18.響f5 he is hopelessly lost,

12.@e4! @xc3 13.bxc3 @xc3 14.261

14... 基b8 can be met very strongly by 15. 實g4 g6 16. Q.g5.

15.≅xb7

15. Wh5 and 15. Wg4 have also been played here, but the text is White's strongest option.



15...\d6?

White was threatening 16.2a3, but the text is not good. 15...豐h4 16.豐d3 罩ad8 17.桌a3 also favours White: 17... 2b5 18.g3! \ g4 會h8 22.實xc3, with a winning advantage for White, Kondali-Letic, correspondence game 1979 or 17... #fe8 18 #c4 #h5 19.@d5 wh8, thus far the correspondence game Nikkanen-Letic, 1978/80, and now 20.f6! would have been very strong: 20...gxf6 21.ke7 or 20...g6 21.₩c7. 15... ab8!? is probably Black's best chance, although this is followed by 16.基xb8 費xb8 17.f6.

16.里b3 里ac8 17.皇a3 響d8

17... 實f6 is met by 18. axf8 公xb3 19. axg7. winning a pawn

18.Xb7!

Back to the seventh rank - always a cherished dream for a rook!

18... Ie8 19. Ixf7!? 19. wh5 wf6 (19... ac7 20.f6) 20. ad5 was also strong.

19...₩g5

The rook was invulnerable: 19... \$\prix xf7\$ 20.響h5+ 雪g8 (or 20...雪f6 21.響xh7 雪f7 22. Wh5+) 21.f6 g6 22. axg6 Wd7 23.f7+, winning.

20. 2d5 wh8 21.f6 q6 Or 21...gxf6 22 @c7

22. Wa4 e4?!

A mistake in a hopeless position. 23.Xxh7+1

Black resigned. There follows 23... \$\prince xh7\$ 24. 響d7+ 雪h6 25. 響g7+ 雪h5 26. 響h7+ 雪g4 (or 26... Wh6 27.g4+ \$25 28.f4+ exf3 e.p. 29.全c1+) 27.費h3+ 全f4 28.全d6+ 其e5 29. Wxc8

SI 43.5

☐ Bouwmeester

Pomer

Bern 1962 1.e4 c5 2.0 f3 0 f6

The Nimzowitsch variation, a rather dubious way to play the Sicilian

3.e5 4 d5 4.0 c3 e6

The move of the real Nimzowitsch fans 4...@xc3 5.dxc3 @c6 6.@f4 e6 has also been tried, but after 7.2c4 @c7 8.0-0 White is slightly better.

5.4xd5 exd5 6.d4 d6

For 6... 2c6, see the game Haba-Kummer.

7. 9b5+ Øc6 White

7... 2d7 8. 2xd7+ wxd7 9.0-0 is good for

8.0-0 @e7 9.c4!

White attacks the black position with tactical means.

9... ⊈e6

After 9...dxc4 White plays 10.d5 a6 11.@a4 h5 12.dxc6 bxa4 13.exd6 wxd6 14.wxa4 0-0 15. Ed1, with a good position

10. e3! wb6 11.a4! 0-0-0?

This makes life easier for White. Better, although also very good for White, is 11...a6 12.exd6 @xd6 13.cxd5 axb5 14.dxe6 fxe6 18.響a8+ ②d8 19.皇g5 皇e7 20.皇xe7 雲xe7 21. Wa3+. Thus Bouwmeester. 12.a5! #c7

12...@xa5 is followed by 13.exd6 @xd6 14 dxc5 @xc5 15 @xc5 @xc5 16 #xa5 13.exd6 @xd6 14.dxc5

Now White wins easily. The rest is silence. 14... ûe5 15.a6 ûxb2 16.axb7+ wb8 17.#a2 dxc4 18.#a4 c3 19. @f4 @xa2 20.@xc7+ @xc7 21.@xc6

Black resigned. SI 43.5

Haba

Kummer

Austria 1998

1.e4 c5 2.0f3 0f6 3.e5 0d5 4.0c3 e6 5.4 xd5 exd5 6.d4 4 c6

A pawn sacrifice that was fairly popular for a good while, but which probably demands too much from the black position.

7.dxc5 @xc5 8. @xd5 @b6 A slightly more refined way to prove the cor-

rectness of 6. Och is 8. d612 9 exd6 Wb6. After 10 We4+ &e6 11 Wh4 the situation is unclear 9. 9 c41

White could have covered the 12 pawn with 9\text{\text{w}}(21)\text{, of course, but after 9...0-0.10.\text{\text{\text{w}}}(4611.\text{\text{exid}} \text{\text{E-8+} his position is very dubious.} 9...\text{\text{\text{w}}}(21+ 10.\text{\text{\text{w}}} \text{\text{0-0}} \text{\text{0-1}} \text{\text{\text{exid}}} \text{\text{0-1}} \text{\text{\text{w}}} \text{\text{\text{0-1}}} \text{\text{

The crucial position of the entire variation. It looks as if White is demonstrating a forced win in this game.



23.⊈c1!

23.費h5 has also been played, but then the white attack falters after 23...包f8 24.置f4 費b3

23...₩d5

This losses; but other moves are no better. A small selection from the various possibilities: 23....g6 $24.\pm$ gd+4 0.xd425.\mathbb{\mathbb{W}(6+\)\mathbb{

₩c5 27.₩e4 h6 28.₩e5, and Black is finished in all cases.

24. If 51 ₩ 11+ After 24. ₩ 37 White wins with 25. If 151 € 18 26. ½ k 171 ₩ x77 27. ½ 6+. and mate, while 24. ₩ 26 is also met by 25. If 151, e.g. 25. ... € 18 26. 26. 4 ₩ 65 (26. ... ½ 64 is met by 27. ₩ x 181 ½ x 182 × 18. ½ x 27 mate) 28. ℤ k 17+. ½ 8. ½ 8. ½ 8. ½ x 27 mate) 28. ℤ k 17+. ½ 8. ½ 8. ½ 8. ½ 8. 30. ℤ k 24 and mate) 27. ½ 6. ₹ 164. and now not 28. ₩ x 187. of course, in view 07. 28. ₩ 261. and White is mated, but 28. 4, with the winning threat of 29. ½ x 5.

25.⇔d2 ₩h2+

25.豐xal 26.量h5 全f8 27.戛xh7+ 全xh7 28.豐h5 g6 29.盒d4+, and mate, or 25..豐h4 26.戛af1, winning, e.g. 26...g6 27.戛h5!.

26. 里f2 wh4 27. 里g1 g6 28. 里h1 wb4+ And Black resigned in view of 29. 如c1 里g7 30. 里xh7+, and mate.

SI 44.7

☐ Rüfenacht

■ Rosen

Correspondence game 1994

1.e4 c5 2.@c3 @c6 3.@ge2

With this move White postpones the decision of whether he will continue with g3 or d4.

3...e5

This is how Black prevents the option 3.d4. The text weakens square d5, but it is not really bad.

4. ad5 age7
4. ace7!? may be more accurate, e.g.

5.\(\text{\Dec}\)ec3 \(\text{\Omega}\)xd5 \(\text{\Omega}\)f6 7.\(\text{\Dec}\)ec4 \(\text{\Dec}\)ec7 8.0-0 d6 9.d3 0-0 10.f4 \(\text{\Omega}\)xd5 11.\(\text{\Dec}\)xd5 exf4 12.\(\text{\Dec}\)xf4 \(\text{\Dec}\)ec6(; with equality, Adorjan-Sveshnikov Alushta 1994

5.@ec3 @xd5 6.@xd5 g6

Safer is 6... 2e7, but White keeps good play. An example is Fischer-Spassky, 19th match game Belgrade 1992: 7.g3 (7.&c4!? also looks logical) 7...d6 8.&g2 h5 9.h4 &c6 look logical) 1...d6 8.&g2 h5 9.h4 &c6 lo.d3 &xd5 ll.exd5 ©h8 12.4 &cd 7.0-od g6, and now the obvious 14.f5! would have yielded White slightly better prospects. 7.h41?

White immediately grabs the initiative on the kingside.

7....@a7

7...h5 is strongly met by 8.d4!: 8...cxd4 9.\(\tilde{\pi}\) \(\tilde{\pi}\) \(

After 9... 2a5? White strikes lightning fast: 10.hxg6! hxg6 (10... 2xc4 11.\(\frac{11}{2}\)\(\frac{15}{2}\)\(\

Rüfenacht has suggested 12...豐d7 13.豐f3 ②e7 14.豐g3 f6 as a stronger option here. 13.豐f3 b5 14.②d5! 耳fc8

After 14...互ac8 15.豐g3 ②b4 16.豐h2 互fd8 17.豐h7+ 盎f8 18.②xe6 豐xe6 19.a3 ②c6 20.②d5 White is also better, Rüfenacht. 15.豐g3 互ab8 16.c3 c4

16...b4 is no better; there follows 17.變h2 bxc3 18.變h7+ 彙f8 19.bxc3, e.g. 19...②d8 20.逾xe6 變xe6 21.②d5 and 22.逾h6.

17.dxc4 bxc4 18.₩h2 ☆f8 19.₩h7 ②d8?

20. £xe6 ₩xe6 21. 2d5 ₩g4 Who sees anything better? 22. £h4! ₩xg2



23.₩xg7+!

SI 44.9

☐ Spassky

■ Hjartarson
Beifort 1988

1.e4 c5 2.公c3 公c6 3.g3 g6 4.ଛg2 ଛg7 5.d3 e6 6.ଛe3 公d4?!

This doesn't look bad, yet this knight move is, in fact, often an inaccuracy when the white king's knight has not yet gone to f3 or e2. A better move is 6...d6.

7.43ce2! b6?!

Again not a good move. Winning the pawn with 7...\$\times_2 \times_2 \times_

White. Smyslov-Denker, match Soviet Union-US. Moscow 1946.



8. 9 xd4!

Not very obvious but quite strong. After 8.c3 のxe2 9 のxe2 息b7 10 費d2 f5 Black would not be bad

8 cxd4 9.e5 Tb8 10.f4 f6

10. d6? won't work in view of 11 @xd4 11.6/f3 fxe5 12.fxe5 @c7 13.6/exd4

14.... 2g7 is followed by 15. 2b5 響c5 16.d4, e.g. 16... \$\psib4+ 17.c3 \$\psie7 18.\$\psic4 d5 19. 響a4! 響d7 20. 全g5, with winning play. 15 @xd4 @c5

15...@e7 16.0-0 also favours White. 16.6 b3 @a5

After 16... We7? 17. We5 both rooks are under attack!

17.0-0 @e7

Black never gets around to castling, as 17.... f6 is out in view of 18.h4 費h5 19. 全f3 響b5 20.c4 響f5 (20...響b4 21.響e5) 21.g4

響f4 22.皇g2 響xg4 23.響e5. 18. Tae1 If8 19. 9 d2! Ixf1+ 20. Ixf1 Øf5

After 20...&b7 White wins with 21. &xb7 買vb7 22 響f3

21.0c4 de7? 21... #e7 was more stubborn. 22.q4 b5

Desperation... After 22... 2h4 23. #f2 or 22... ①h6 23. 實行2 桌a6 24. 實g3 星g8 25. 實d6+ \$\text{de8} 26.\$\text{de5} \text{\ti}\text{\tex Black can also resign.

23.gxf5 bxc4 24.\est \alpha a8 And Black resigned.

SI 45.7

☐ Krapivin

■ Morozov

Pskov 1998 1.e4 c5 2.4 c3 4 c6 3.q3 q6 4.4 q2 4 q7 5.d3 d6 6.f4 e5 7.9 h3

Another good move is 7.2f3.

7...@ge7

7...exf4, in order to prevent the push f4-f5 once and for all, may be a better option. The position after 8. 2xf4 (8.gxf4? 2xh3 9.2xh3 Wh4+ costs a piece) 8... Dge7 9.0-0 0-0 10. 2e3 Zb8 is reasonably playable for Black. 8.0-0 0-0?!

Very careless! Now White will attack immediately. Better options are 8...@d4!? or still 8...exf4!?.

9.f5! axf5

Black can try to keep the position closed with 9...f6, but after 10.g4 this is not satisfactory either, e.g. 10...g5 11. 2f2 Eb8 12.h4 h6 13. h3 b5 14.hxg5 hxg5, and the sacrifice 15. 2xg5! fxg5 16. 2xg5 yields strong threats for White (Lane-Manet, Fourmies 1995).

10.exf5 @xf5?

This move is refuted, but after 10... axf5 White has the very strong move 11. Wh5!. while 10...f6 11. Wh5 also leaves Black with an awkward position, e.g. 11...@d4 12.@d5 @d7 13.@e5! fxe5 14.f6! @xd5 15.@xd5+ &e6 16.f7+! \$\dagger h8 17.\dagger e4 \Delta f5 18.\dagger xf5 @xf5 19 Exf5, with a large advantage for White, Solomon-Wojtkiewicz, Philadelphia 1994



11 Exf5!

This exchange sacrifice quickly yields White a winning attack

11...@xf5 12.@e4 @h6

Other moves are no better, e.g. 12...@fd4 13. 響h5 罩e8 (13...f5 is met by the characteristic 14.2d5+ wh8 15.2g5 h6 16. wg6! hxg5 17. Wh5 mate) 14. Wxh7+ 由f8 15. ag5 Wd7 16.2d5 Ie6 17.If1 2xc2 18.kg6 22d4 19. £h6, and Black resigned, Bilek-Gheorghiu, Bucharest 1968, or 12...@fe7 13. kxh7+ \$\psixh7 14.\psih5+ \psig8 15.\Qg5, and wins.

13. Wh5 d5

Black dreams up another attempt, but it won't work. 13... Wf6 is met by 14. 2d5 We6 15. 2e5 ₩g4 16. 2f6+ 2xf6 17. ₩xh6, and mate on h7. 14.4 xd5 f5 15.4 xh6 fxe4 16.4 xq7 \$xq7 17.€a5

All this is forced. Now White is threatening both 18. wxh7, mate, and 18. e6+, so Black again has no choice

17... 賞xd5 18. 賞xh7+ 公f6 19.h4! White has time to keep the knight on 95.

19...Ød4 Black's only option.

20. If1+ € f3+ 21. da2

Black is helpless. 21... Ih8 22. 2xe4+ se6 23. g6+ se7 24. Ixf3 Ihf8 25. #q5+ #e6 26.c4 Black resigned. It's all over: 26... #c6

27.響g6+ ge7 28.響g7+

SI 45.15

☐ Romanishin ■ Van Welv

Stary Smokovec 1992

1.e4 c5 2.4 c3 e6 3.g3 4 c6 4.4 g2 g6 5.d3 ag7 6.ae3 d6 7.wd2 ab8 8.age2 @d4 9.0-0 @e7 10.@h6 @xe2+?!

Safer is 10...0-0! 11.@xg7 @xg7 12.@xd4 cxd4 13.@e2 e5 14.f4 f6, when the position is approximately equal.

11.4 xe2 @ xb2

A pawn is a pawn, but we will see that the black king will now be stuck in the centre, A high price...

12 Tah1 Or 12. #ad1 &f6 13 d4 cxd4 14 @xd4 a6 15. 26 f3 e5 16. ₩xd6 ₩xd6 17. Exd6 2e6 21. aa6 ad7, and despite the queen swap White was still better, although Bronstein-

12....@f6 13.d4 cxd4

Suetin, Moscow 1981, ended in a draw Maybe 13, e512 is a better idea. 14.6 xd4 a6

14...@c6 15.@b5 &e7 16.≣fd1 is also good for White

15.¤fd1 &d7 16.6/f3 & c8

Black has a very awkward position, but how can White make progress?



17 e5!

This is how!

17...dxe5

17.... £xe5? is always bad in view of 18. €xe5 dxe5 19.2g7 Ig8 20.2xe5.

18.@a5 âe7

18.. @xe5 19.@xe5 f6 is impossible: 20.@xf6.

19.のxf7 ゆxf7 20.費xd7 費xd7 21.算xd7 is also good for White, but the text is far strong-

19...**X**a8

An awful move to play, but after 19...f6 20. Qe7 星g8 21. Qxf6! Qxf6 22. Qxf6+ 資xf6 23. 賞xd7+ 如f8 24. 賞c7 it is curtains.

20. £q5!

Now Black quickly succumbs to the weakness of the dark squares. The end speaks for itself

20.... £xa5

Or 20... #c7 21. 2xe7 exe7 22. #g5+ ef8 23. 2f6, winning.

21.4 xq5 b5

After 21... \$\begin{align*} \pmax{21... \$\begin{align*} \pmax{22.} \$\begin{align*} \pmax{22.} \$\begin{align*} \pmax{23!}, after \end{align*} which 22...wxe5 won't wash in view of 23.Wc7.

22. Pe4 Pb6 23. 微d6 草c8

After 23 .6 c4 White wins with 24.6 f6+. 24. wxe5 f5 25. 0 d6+ we7 26. 0 xc8+ @xc8 27. gc5+ gf6 28. gc6 Ig7 29 Wd4+ e5 30 Wh4+

Black resigned. SI 48.5

☐ Yilmaz

■ Konatly

Thessaloniki Olympiad 1984

1.e4 c5 2.9 f3 @ c6 3.b4!?

Correct or not, this move is certainly interestine! 3 cxh4

3...@xb4 is met by 4.c3 @c6 5.d4.

4.d4 e6

After 4...d5 White plays 5.exd5 \widetilde{w}xd5 6.c4. e.g. 6...bxc3 e.p. 7. 0xc3 wa5 8.d5!? wxc3+ 9.2d2, and White is ahead in development. Another option is to play 4...g6!? and meet 5.d5 with 5. @ e7.

5.d5 An alternative is 5,a3!?; White gets some

chances for his pawn. The text leads to an attractive battle that ends in move repetition.

5...\forall f6!? 6.c3 bxc3 7.dxc6 c2 8.\forall xc2 Less good is 8 cxd7+?!: after 8. @xd7 9 Wd4 Wxd4 10 公xd4 cxb1 W 11 草xb1 草c8 Black is better.

8 Wya1 9 e5! Locking in the black queen. 9...@e7

Also interesting is 9... ab4+!?, which could be followed by 10.\$\d1! \@e7 11.\$\c4 \@d5 12 @xd5 exd5 13 Wb3 dxc6 (13 a52) is no. better: 14.@e3 dxc6 15.@d4 a4 16.\\xi\xb4 \xi\xa2 17. 2 fd2 2 f5 18. 2 a3, and Black has problems) 14. wxb4 wxa2 15. a3 c5 16. wxc5 wxb1+. and Black has perpetual check.

10.a3 @xc6 11. &b2



11...@b4!

This is how Black rescues his queen. Less good is 11...費a2?! 12.公c3 公b4 13.費d2 ₩b3 14 Ød4 Øc2+ 15 ₩xc2 ₩xc2 16. 2xc2, with advantage for White.

12.₩c1

White settles for a draw: 12.axb4 @xb4+

would have vielded a very unclear position. 12...@a2

And here a draw was agreed in view of repetition of moves after 13 \cong c2 40h4

SI 48 9

☐ Korolev ■ Koskinen

Correspondence game 1993

1.e4 c5 2.q3

A controlled way to fight the Sicilian. 2 d5

The sharpest reply; but the quiet 2... @c6 is

3.exd5 ₩xd5 4.@f3 âg4

After 4 9c6 50c3 We6+ 6 9e2 0d4 7.@xd4 cxd4 8.@b5 Wc6 the position is approximately equal.

5.2a2 We6+ 6.4f1

This is a rather strange position for the king. but e6 isn't a great place for the black queen either: 6 We2?! Wxe2+7 doxe2 @c6 makes it easy for Black of course

6... @ h3

Playable alternatives are 6. \$\Phi\$c6. 6. \$\pside d6\$ and 6...\#a6+



7 h4!?

An interesting pawn sacrifice that has yielded good results

7...cxb4 8.a3 b3

After 8...bxa3 White gets good chances. A nice example is 9.€xa3 @c6 10.d4 #d7 11.c4 0-0-0 12.6b5 a6 13.4f4! f6 14 d5 e5 15.響e2 exf4 16.dxc6 bxc6 17.置xa6 響d1+ Φd8 21 @xh3 Øh6 22 Ec8+ Φe7 23 Ec7+ \$\psi d8 24.\bar{a}d7+ \psi c8 25.\Da7+ \psi b8 26.\Dc6+ lev-Zemin, correspondence game 1980. 8...@c6 9.@b2 also gives White good prospects: 9. @f6 10.axb4 @xb4 11.@a3 e6 12. Ibl a5 13. 2xf6 exf6 14.c3 2c6 15. 2b5. with good chances, Nadyrkhanov-Odeev, Vockrecensk 1993

9. 4 c3 4 f6 10. 2b1 4 c6

10...\u00ecc4+ may be better: |1.\u00ecc2| bxc2 12.費xc2 Qxg2 [3.如xg2 @bd7! [4.基xb7 e6 15.₩b2 â.e7 16.₩b5 ₩c8 17.@e5 a6, and Black managed to hold, Korolev-Zelinsky, correspondence game 1984.

11. Xb3 Wd7 12. We2 0-0-0

Korolev rejected this move in his commentary to the game, but 12...@xg2+ 13.\preceqxg2 e6 14. a.b2 a.e7 15. a.e4 is also good for White. 13.d4 @xq2+ 14. dxq2 e6

14... ②xd4? is bad: 15. ②xd4 wxd4 16. wf3. and Black is lost.

15. £f4 £d6

Other moves are certainly bad: 15...@xd4? 16 @xd4 @xd4 17 數63 @d5 18 單d1 or 15 @d52 16@xd5 exd5 17 Thb1 b6 18.基xb6! axb6 19.基xb6, and wins, Koroley, 16. axd6 曾xd6 17. ahb1 ad7 18. ab5 W_{d5} After 18.. Wh8. 19. 0e5! 0 xe5 20 dxe5 0e8

21. #d1! wins 19.c4 #e4 20. #b2 b6

This was forced, as White was threatening 21 60-3

21 Te3 Wf5

Or 21... #g6 22. @e5 @xe5 23.dxe5, 22.@e5! @xe5 23.\xe5 \q6



24. II c5+1

Black resigned in view of 24...bxc5 25 @xa7+ dod8 26 Wh8+ doe7 27 @c6 mate

SI 48 16

☐ Hamdouchi

Al Modiahki

Arabia 2001

1.e4 c5 2.@f3 e6 3.b3

Whoever wants to avoid the long theoretical lines after 3 d4 can fall back on this method of developing the queenside.

3 h6

Black can develop his knights, of course, but the text is regarded as the most flexible continuation; he keeps all his options open.

4.d4

White suddenly returns to the beaten paths of the Open Sicilian.

4...cxd4 5.@xd4 &b7

Careful types would probably prefer 5...a6. which allows White to cover his e-pawn in a natural way with 6.2d3.

6.Øb5

Without this knight sortie the white plan won't work, because the e-pawn is hanging. 6...d5!?

Black has a wide choice. For a start, he can take the pawn, of course: 6...\(\hat{a}\)xe4 7.\(\Delta\)1c3 âc6 8, âf4 ₩f6!? (simply 8... 2a6 should not be rejected out of hand either) 9.42c7+ \$\dd{4}d8 10.\daggedd d2 \daggedc \dagge 12. axf6 @xf6 13.a3 won't work, and 10...h6 11 @xa8 @b4 12 0-0-0 (Bakre-Ad Horvath. Budapest 2001) is unpleasant), and White has nothing better than to quickly force move repetition with 11.2e8 #g6 12.2c7 #f6.

After 6...@f6 7.@1c3 (7.e5 can be met strongly by 7...a6!) 7...d5 the game plan 8 exd5 a6 9. 4f4 fails in view of 9...axb5 10 @xb5+ @bd7 11 dxe6 fxe6 12 @e2 @b4 13.0-0-0 We7!, and Black was winning in Gabrilakis-Milovanovic, Greek team championship 2002.

7.exd5

After 7.全f4 響f6 8.のc7+ 中d8 9.のxa8 響xf4 the knight on a8 won't have long to live. 7...a6



8. 0 f4!?

Pure speculation! On the other hand, Black has nothing to grumble about after 8.45c3

8...axb5 9.@xb5+ @d7 10.dxe6 fxe6 11.₩h5+ фe7?!

It is very doubtful whether the white pawns constitute sufficient compensation for the sacrificed piece after 11...g6 12.\ext{\text{\$\tex{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\}\exititt{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\te 13. 響xe6+ 響e7 14. 響xe7+ xxe7 15.0-00-0. 12.0c3 @af6 13.\hat{\psi}h3 \psif7 14.0-0 a5

Black is not hanging about. 15.2xq5 Zq8 16.f4 @c7

Even after the better 16...h6 White plays 17 Aad1, and Black continues to find it difficult to shepherd his pieces into a harmonious set-up.

17. ad1 &c5+ 18. bh1 @f8 19. ad2 0 h4 20 0 xf6 0 xf6 21 f5 ₩xc3 22.Wh6+

A dubious move, but it is immediately successful. 22.fxe6+! \$\psig 7 23.\$\pid7+ \$\psi h8\$ 24 Wxc3+ @xc3 25 Exb7 @xe6 26 Exb6 vields White an advantage, because the white pawn army now dominates.

This seemingly safe retreat in fact precipitates Black's downfall. After the brave 22. 中e5! 23 単f4+ 中f6 White will find it perpetual check) 24...\$\psi_97 25.\$\psi_f7+ \$\psi_h8\$ 26. 響xb7 響xd2 27. 響xa8 響xc2, with an endgame that is hard to assess.

23.₩h4+ ŵf7 24.fxe6++ ŵg7 25.¤d7+ Black resigned.

SI 49 4

☐ Anand

■ Gelfand Wiik aan Zee 1996

1 e4 c5 2 @c3

2.f4 at once has the important drawback that it allows Black to play 2...d5. After 3.exd5 Black can play 3... wxd5, but he can also sacrifice a pawn with 3... af6 to get a lead in development: 4 @b5+12 @d7 5 @xd7+ Wxd7 6 c4 e612

White's move order is pre-eminently suitable for use against hardened Najdorf fanatics like Gelfand and Kasparov. They are not very likely to meet 2. @c3 with 2... @c6 or 2...e6, as this would allow White to aim for an open Sicilian (and sidesten the Naidorf!) with 3. 2f3 or the even more subtle 3.@ge2 (see Rüfenacht-Rosen, SI 44.7).

This is the so-called Grand Prix Attack. which became very popular in weekend tournament circles in Great Britain in the '70s. White tries to grab the initiative on the kingside as quickly as possible. Playing the often essential advance d6-d5 costs Black a valuable tempo in this move order.

3...g6 4.@f3 @g7 5.@c4 @c6 6.d3 e6 7.0-0 @qe7 8.\end{a}e1 h6

A waiting move to gauge White's intentions. 9 9 h3 a6

After 9...@d4 10.@xd4 cxd4 11.@e2 0-0 12. h1 f5 13. Qg1 White has good play. Topalov-Van Wely, Wijk aan Zee 1996. 10.e5!?

An earlier game between the same players, Anand-Gelfand, Reggio Emilia 1991/92, saw 10.a4 草b8 11.響g3, and now Anand has indicated 11...b5!? as the correct move: 12.f5 exf5 13. &f4 c4!, with very unclear play.

10...@f5

Good for White is 10...dxe5 11.fxe5 g5!? (after 11... @xe5?! 12. @xe5 #d4+ 13. \$h1 響xe5 14.實f2 White has good play for the pawn) 12.@e4 g4 13.@f6+, Anand.

11. dh1 @fd4 12.@e4

No better is 12.@xd4 cxd4 13,@e4; after 13...dxe5 14.響g3 (14.fxe5 axe5! is simply good for Black) 14... #e7! 15.fxe5 @xe5 16.皇f4 皇xf4 17.墓xf4 f5! 18.響xg6+ 事d8 19. @g3 \g5. Black has an excellent position. Anand.

12...@xf3 13.Exf3 dxe5 14.fxe5 @xe5 14.... xe5?! is now strongly met by 15. 實f2.

15.\alphaf1 a5!

After 15...0-0?! White plays 16. 2xh6! 2xh6 (16...公xd3 17.響e3) 17.公f6+ 含g7 18.響xe5 #d4 19. #g3, with an attack; the threat is Hal-el-e4 Thus Anand

16.₩a3

16.h4!?, a suggestion by Lane, was also an

16...0-0



17. 2 xq5!

17.@xg5? hxg5 18.@xg5 is simply met by 18. f6. and after 17.0 xc5 b6 18.0 e4.0 b7 White wins back the pawn, but his plus has melted away.

17...hxq5 18.@xq5 @q6 19.#ae1

19.\\gamma 24 won't work in view of 19...\\gamma d4 20.Wh5 Wh4.

19... #e7 20. #f5!

After 20. #g4? Black now has 20...\$f6, e.g. ₩g7, and White has shot his bolt.

Obvious enough, but maybe not the strongest move. With 21.h4!? &g7 22.h5 White wins back his piece. Again according to a suggestion from Lane

21 fxe6?

Now White can engineer a brilliant finish to the game. The correct reply is 21... Ee8!; after 22.\(\mathbb{I}\)eff (after 22.\(\mathbb{I}\)e4 \(\hat{\omega}\)xe6 23.\(\hat{\omega}\)xe6 fxe6 24. 響xg6+ êg7 25. 星h5, 25... 響f6 is enough) 25. #f3 White has compensation for his piece, but the position is far from clear.

22. Exe6! \$a7

Or 22... @xe6 23. @xe6+ @e7 24. @xe6+. 23. #xe7+ @xe7 24. #xf8 @xf8 25.h4 Black resigned.

SI 49.4

□ Berzins ■ Iaracz

Swidnica 1999

1.e4 c5 2.0c3 d6 3.f4 0c6 4.0f3 g6 5.&c4 &g7 6.0-0 e6 7.d3 @ge7 8.We1 0-0

Castling early is often dangerous in the Grand Prix Attack. The king position immediately comes under pressure.

9.f5! 9 &b3 @a5 10 &e3 b6 11.&f2 &b7 turned out to be harmless in Tiviakov-Kasparov,

Wiik aan Zee 2001.

9...d5 10.@b3 c4 The principled move with which Black aims to refute the white set-up. An extremely

dangerous strategy. 11.dxc4 d4

11...dxe4 12.f6 @xf6 (the black king position minus the dark-squared bishop is ripe for the slaughter, which means that 12...exf3 13.fxg7 \$\prime xg7 14.\prime xf3 is far too risky) 13.\prime xe4 \hat{\text{\omega}}g7 14. £g5 h6? (Black has to play 14...f6 or 14...f5 here) 15.wh4! f5 16.Ead1 wc7 17. 2d6, and White is winning (Mitkov-Amir, Junior world championship, Santiago 1990), because 17...hxg5 18.@xg5 \$\mathbb{Z}d8 fails to 19.c5.

12.f6! @xf6 13.e5 @xe5

The alternative also has drawbacks: 13 8 o7 14 Øc4 Øxc5 15 Øxc5 8xc5 16.2g5! (after 16.2h6?! 2g7 17.2f6+ £xf6 18.£xf8 €f5! Black's compensation should not be underestimated) 16...f5 17 費h4 耳f7 18 夕f6+ 泉xf6 (18. 如h8 19. ae1 &d6 20.c5! &xc5 21. e4 gives White a strong attack) 19.2xf6 #f8 20. ≜xd4 @c6. Black is under great pressure (Short-Oll, Tallinn 1998), but for the moment he will be able to hold.

14. 0 xe5 dxc3 15. \(\pi xc3 \) 0 xe5 16. \(\pi xe5 \) Øf5 17.c3 f6 18.₩e2

18 賞e4 賞h6+19.耳f2 如e7 (19...h5!?) 20.e4 2d6 21, ₩f4, with enormous pressure on the king position.

18...e5 19.c5+ da7 20.wf2

Before chasing the knight from f5, White covers the h4 square. It is true that 20.g4 @h4!? looks premature.

20...\@c7

20...h5!? prevents White's plan, but at the cost of weakening the kingside further.

21.h3 b6?

The idea to put the bishop on the long diagonal is excellent, but the execution is wrong. The game makes the difference with 21....&d7! and 22....&c6 painfully clear.

22.g4! @e7?!

0 A

Completely overlooking White's beautiful combination. But 22... Wc5 23.gxf5 &xf5, losing a piece, can hardly be called a serious alternative.

置金

23. gh6+!! wxh6 24.g5+ wxg5

With the bishop on d7 the rooks would now be connected and 24 fxe5 would make a nonsense of White's combination. The retreat 24... \$27 won't help either in view of 25.gxf6+ \$h8 26.fxe7!.

25. ₩e3+ \$h4 26. ₩h6+ \$q3 27. Zae1! Mate can only be prevented with the hopeless 27 Wc5+ 28 Fe3+ Wxe3+ 29 Wxe3+ Black resigned.

SI 49.8

□ Nogradi ■ Kahn

Budanest 1996 1.e4 c5 2.0 c3 d6 3.f4 q6 4.0 f3 & q7

5. ac4 e6 6.f5 exf5 7.d3 @e7 8.0-0 0-0? After this obvious move White gets a murderous attack, Regarded as stronger is 8...@bc6 9.\exists 11.g4 \hat{a}xg4 12.@xf7+ \$\psixf7 13.@e5++ \$\psig8 14.@xg4 2d4, with good play for Black, Hellers-Gelfand, Novi Sad Olympiad 1990.

9. we1 6 bc6 10. wh4



10...₩c7

A well-known game with 10... #d7 is Tarjan-Rattinger, Mayagüez 1971: 11. h6 fxe4 12. ②g5 響g4 13. 基xf7! 響xh4? (13... Qd4+ is more stubborn but after 14 doh1 #xf7 15. 2xf7+ 2h8 16. 2g7+ 2xg7 17. 2xh7+ \$\psi 18.\psi 1 White also wins) 14.\psi xg7++ \$\psi h8 15.\psi xh7 mate. With 10...h5 Black can prevent 11. &h6, but then 11. &g5 is strong. 11. 9 h6 @e5 12.@q5

Now the white win is not difficult. 12...@xc4 13.@xq7 @xq7 14.\\xin xh7+ \$f6 15.\$h6 \$\mathbb{I} a8 16.e5+ \$\mathbb{X} xe5

 dxe5 or 16. @xe5 runs into 17.@ce4 mate. 17. Iae1+ &f6 18. Øh7+

Black resigned.

222

SI 49 8

□ Spangenberg ■ Ftacnik

Moscow Olympiad 1994

1.e4 c5 2.@c3 d6 3.f4 q6 4.@f3 &q7 5. c4 e6 6.0-0 @e7 7.d3 @bc6 8.f5 d5!? After 8 .. exf5 White plays 9 We1. as in Nog-

radi-Kahn

9. 9. b3 dxe4 10.fxq6!?

White cannot afford to be afraid in this line. After 10.dxe4 the queen swap solves all Black's problems, while 10.f6 &xf6 11. 2xe4 @g7 12.@g5 f5 is also good for Black.

10...exf3 11.gxf7+ 公f8 12.資xf3 資d4+ 12... 2d4 is obvious enough, but after 13. ₩h5 @ef5 14. @e4 White has compensation for the

sacrificed piece.

13.sh1 のe5 14.we2

After 14. \$\mathbb{\text{#}}\text{h5} Black now has 14... \$\mathbb{\text{#}}\text{g4}, swapping the queens

14... #g4 15. #f2 b6 16.h3 #g6 17. £f4 ŵ h7

17... @xf7? costs Black material: 18.₩f3. 18.Eae1 c4 19.dxc4?!

Here 19. Exe5!? is probably stronger: 19. cxb3 (19. @xe5? 20.@xe5 costs Black his h8 rook) 20 axb3@f5 and now 21 @e4!? with complicated play, according to Plaskett in his book Sicilian Grand Prix Attack.

19 @xf7 20 @b521

This move is definitely less good. Maybe 20.c51? &d4.21. &h6+ would have offered better prospects, although it is doubtful whether White will have compensation for his piece after 21...\$\pie8!? (after 21...\$\pie8 22.\$\hat{e}3 \$\hat{k}xc3 23.bxc3 2f5 White can probably afford Plaskett's suggestion 24.cxb6!? @g3+ 25.wh2 ②xf1+26.₩xf1 – White has compensation for his rook), e.g. 22. Qa4+ Qc6 23. 實行 其c8.

20...@f5! 21.@c7 #e8!

Surprising! 22.4 xe8

0 22... û d4!

The point of Black's counterplay. 23.Wd2

After 23.We2, 23... Ig8 also wins, e.g. 24 9 c7 & x e2+ 25 & h2 e5! 26 c5 & x f1 27 #xf1 @c3! 28 @xe5 @xe5 A beautiful little variation!

23... I q8 24. I e2 W q3!

A nice final flourish! White resigned, since he loses in all variations, as witness 25. 2xg3 @xe3+ 26.dbh2 @xf1+ 27.dbh1 @xd2 28. Axd2 Axg2 29. Axg2 如xe8, or 25. Wb4+ £c5 26.₩xc5+ bxc5 27.£xg3 €xg3+ 28.gh2 @xf1+ 29.gg1 gxe8, or 25.要xd4 ₩xh3+ 26. âh2 âxg2+.

SI 49.8

□ Hodgson

■ Nunn

London 1978

1.e4 c5 2.f4 @c6 3.@f3 g6 4.@c3 @g7 5.2c4 d6 6.0-0 46

Strangely enough, you don't see this set-up very often. White has no starting-point on e6. but the bishop diagonal to f7 remains free. 7.d3 0-0 8.f5

Here, too, White needs to play energetically. Anand has explained the drawback of 8.2b3. After 8... 2d4 9. We1 a5! (this is why the knight must not go to a5!) 10. Wh4 the threat of a5-a4 can be prepared with 10... a.d7, because 11.e5 a4 12.exf6 @xf6 is good for Black.

8...axf5

You can only refute a sacrifice by accepting it! But the safer 8...@a5!? was still a good option. 9.₩e1



9...fxe4

Now it's already too late for 9... €a5: 10. ₩h4 @xc4 11.dxc4 @xe4 12.@xe4 fxe4 13.@g5 h6 14.@xe4 \pih7 15.@g5+ \pig8 16.@e4 \pih7 17.基f3! f6 18.象d2.象d7 19.其af1 We8 20 其e3 with a winning attack, Nilsson-Välkesalmi. correspondence game 1995/97.

But 9... ad4!? may well be a better idea than the text.

10.dxe4 @q4

10... ②d4!? is still a good alternative: 11. 響h4 ₩d7 12.h3 b5 13.&d5 @xd5 14.@xd5 f6 15. 2xd4 cxd4 16. 2f5, with an unclear position, Angelov-Kaminski, Tuzla 1990.

11.₩h4

The game Sorokin-Baburin, Voronezh 1988 saw 11.2f4 2xf3 12.2xf3 2h5 13.2g5 2e5 14.草h3 ②xc4 15.贊h4! 总d4+ 16.由h1 f6 17. ₩xh5 If7 18. 2h6 @e5 19. @d5 c4 20.c3 âc5 21.萬f1 由h8 22.萬f5 e6 23.息e5!, and Black resigned. Quite apart from the question of whether 11.244 is stronger than the text, this certainly is a fine attacking game! 11... 9 xf3

castled position with ... 2g6. 12. #xf3 @e5 13. #h3 @a6

Black must not take the bishop: 13...@xc4

14 @d5! 14. wq3 wd7 15. 2d5

The weak spot in the black position is h7 which is why @f6 must be exchanged. 15...9 xd5

Bad is 15... 2xe4? 16. #f3 2f6 17. 2xf6+ £xf6.18 ₩h5 and h7 falls

16. 9 xd5 e6 17 9 h3 d5 18 @f3 c4



19. a4! wxa4 20. wh5 Ifd8 21 wxh7+

The magnet sacrifice has forced Black into defensive mode even more, but this is the moment that he really slips up. After the game Nunn indicated 23 c3! as the correct move: 24. Axg6 賞d4+ 25. 字h1 賞f2 (but not 25...cxb2? 26.其f1 實f2 27.實g7+ 由e7 28. \$\pi\(f\), winning!), with an unclear position-26. wh6+ ae7 27. wg5+ ad7 28. 耳f6 cxb2 29 基f1 費b6. 24.¤f1! de8

Otherwise White plays 25. \wxg6. 25. wg8+ @f8 26. Exe6+! &d8 27. wxf8+ \$c7 28. #c5+ \$d8 29. Ih6

Black resigned.

SI 50.7

☐ Flesch ■ Kadar

Hungary 1979

1.e4 c5 2.d4 cxd4 3.c3

The Morra gambit. If Black accepts the pawn, White will be ahead in development and get good chances along the c and d-files.

3...dxc3

Black can decline the gambit with 3... 166 or 3...d5, when positions from the Alapin variation 1.e4 c5 2.c3 arise.

4. 9 xc3 9 c6 5. 9 f3 q6 6. 2 c4

6.h4 has been played here, too. A nice example is Hiortstam-Genestier, correspondence game 1994/95: 6... Qf6 7.h5 Qxh5 8. Exh5!? gxh5 9, 2g5 h6?! (the Jaconic 9... 2g7 10. 響xh5 罩f8 seems a better idea. How is White to proceed?) 10.響xh5 @e5 11.象b5!? a6? (and here Black should have gone 11...hxg5! 12.₩xh8 @g6; White can then play 13, wg8, with the threat of &b5-e2-h5, but the position is not very clear) 12 Se6! Sd3+ 13 sbd1 Sxf2+ 14 sbc2 Wb6 15.公d5 資xe6 16.公c7+, and wins,

6... g7 7.0-0

7 e512 may be more accurate: 7...@h6 8.&f4 0-0 9,0-0, transposing to the game. 7. @h62!

According to Flesch, Black could have played 7...d6! here, e.g. 8.\existse2 &f6 9.\existse41 \hat{2.24} 10.h3 &xf3 11.wxf3 公e5 12.&b5+ 公fd7 13 We2 a6, with good play for Black.

8. 9 f4 0-0 9.e5! \$h8

No stronger is 9... 2g4, e.g. 10. ac1 2a5 11 9d5 e6 12 9e4 Oc4 13 #c1! Ocxe5 14.h3 f5 15.&d5! @xf3+16.&xf3 e5 17.hxg4 exf4 18.gxf5 d6 19.40d5, with good play for White, Nei-Livshin, Kharkov 1956.

10.\@e1 4\q8

The active 10 f6 has serious drawbacks: White simple takes on f6 after which 11...exf6 is met strongly by 12.2b5, while 11... #xf6 is followed by 12.40d5.



11.@a5! @h6

After 11... we8? White plays 12. 65 ab8 13.e6, while 11...e6 12. wd3! f6 13.exf6 axf6 14. ad6 @e7 15. 響h3 h6 16. ad1 leaves White with the better position. Thus the Hungarian Pálkövi.

12.₩d2 a6 13.Xe3! @g4 13...b5 is nicely refuted by 14.@xh7!, e.g. 14 doxb7 15 \$\mathbb{H}b3 or 14 bxc4 15 &xb6! @xb6 (15 dbxh7 16 Eh3) 16 Eh3 @xd2 17.66+, and mate. But the text leaves Black with a hopeless position as well.

14. Ih3 @axe5 15. @xh7 d5 16. Ih4 Played very coolly. White is winning.

16 - 0 xc4

Or 16 dxc4 17 @f6+ @h6 18 @xh6 exf6 19.2g7++ \$xg7 20. \$\bar{y}\$h6+, and mate. 17.6 f6+ &h6 18. e5!

Black resigned in view of 18... axd2 19. Exh6+ &g7 20. Eh7 mate.

SI 50.8

□ Burgess ■ Jacobsen

Glamsbiero 1992

1.e4 c5 2.d4 cxd4 3.c3 dxc3 4.4 xc3 e6 5 @f3 @c6 6 @c4 @c5 7.0-0 a6 8.@f4 8. 響e2 夕ge7 9. 全g5!? was a good alternative. 8...4\qe7

After 8, d62! 9 a3! the threat of 10 b4 forces Black to play the ugly 9...e5, after which White plays 10. 25 @ge7 11.b4 2a7 12. 2d5, and White is better, After 8...b5 9. &b3 @ge7 White plays 10.e5, as in the game.

9.e5!? 0-0

9... 2g6 is met simply by 10.2g3, and if Black still insists on castling. White launches an attack with 11 h4

10 @e4! @a7?

This is not a good place for the bishop. It was badly needed for the defence of the kingside. But 10... 2g6 11. 2g3 2e7 also gives White a good position.

11.âa5 ₩c7

11...@xe5 12.@xe5 f6 is beautifully refuted by 13. 2xf6 gxf6 14. 2xe6+ dxe6 15. 2xf6+ \$07 16.6h5+



12.4/f6+! axf6 13.4xf6 4/f5

This loses by force. But 13...h6 won't hold for Black either: 14.4d3, and now 14.40f5 15.₩a4! or 14... Qg6 | 15. Qg5! @cxe5 16.Wh5

14.6 d4! h6

After 14...@xe5 White plays 15.@xf5 exf5 16.費h5 &d4 17.饗g5+ 公g6 18. axd4 饗xc4 19.\footnote{\psi}f6. and wins.

15.9 xf5 9 xe5 Or 15, exf5 16 Wh5

16. gq4+!

Very nice! Black is mated.

16...@xq4 17.@e7+ @h7 18.@d3 Mate

SI 50 10

☐ Belenko

■ Rivlin Correspondence game 1990

1.e4 c5 2.d4 cxd4 3.c3 dxc3 4.9 xc3 Øc6 5.Øf3 d6 6.&c4 e6 7.0-0 Øf6 8. we2 a6 9. Id1 wc7 10. af4 ae7 All these are standard moves. Thanks to the

pressure along the c and d-files. White has enough compensation for the sacrificed pawn.

For the alternative 11. Zac1, see the game

Christensen-Nielsen 11...@h5

An example with 11...dxe5?! is F.Andersen-Nicolaisen, Copenhagen 2000: 12.4 xe5 @xe5 13.@xe5 Wc6 (after 13...Wa5, 14.b4! is strong, e.g. 14. @xb4 15.6\d5! 6\xd5 16.\xd5 #a4 17. axe7 with advantage for White) 14. Db5! 0-0 15. Dc7 Ea7 16. £d3 b6 17. Eac1 響a4 18.基c4 響xa2 19.基f4 盒d8? 20.基xf6! gxf6 (or 20...@xf6 21.\ext{\ti}\text{\ti}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\ti}\ti}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\tin}\tint{ 22.@xf6+ @xf6 23.Wh5, and mate.

12 exd6? @xf4 13 dxc7 @xe2+ 14 @xe2 2d7 simply costs White a pawn.

12.... xq5

White meets 12...d5?! strongly with 13. 2xd5, but 12...dxe5 is worth looking at. e.g. 13. axe7 @f4 14. we4 f5 15. we3 wxe7 16. axe5 axe5 17. wxe5 ag6, Pálkövi. White probably has compensation for the pawn, but the position is by no means clear.

13.@xq5 @f4

13...@xe5? is refuted by 14.@b5+!. 14.₩f3 dxe5

After 14...@xe5 15. @xf4. and now 15...@xc4 16.b3 @e5 17.@ce4 or 15...₩xc4 16.@ge4 0-0 17. Zac1, White has compensation in both cases

15.@ce4



15...@d4?

This is most certainly wrong. According to an analysis by Palikovi, Black should have played 15...0-01, after which Palikovi gives the continuation 16.93 ≥ 696 17.92.ht7! × 24.ht7 1 8.Wh5t ± 696 19.02.ht7 ± 24.ht7 18.Wh5t ± 696 19.02.ht7 ± 696 19.02.ht7 ± 676 19.02.ht7

16.₩a3! f6

17.@d6+ &d7 18.@ge4 @d5

No better is 18...f5 1° . \mathbb{E} ac1 fxe4 $20.\mathfrak{L}$ b5+axb5 $21.\mathbb{E}$ xc7+ \mathfrak{L} xc7 $22.\mathbb{W}$ c5+ \mathfrak{L} b8 $23.\mathbb{W}$ xc5 \mathfrak{L} h3+ $24.\mathbb{L}$ fr]! \mathfrak{L} c6 $25.\mathbb{W}$ xg7, with a winning advantage for White.

19.⊒ac1 ₩c6

And here 19...₩b6 is no better: 20.âxd5 exd5 21.\(\tilde{\tilde{L}}\) xd4! exd4 22.\(\tilde{L}\) c5+, with a winning attack.

20.₩q3

20. xd5 wins as well: 20... wxd5 21. 2c4.

20...q6 21.@xf6+ @xf6

After 21... \(\psi\)xd6 22.\(\psi\)xd4 it is also finished.

22.\(\psi\)xe5 \(\psi\)e7 23.\(\psi\)xd4 \(\psi\)d7 24.\(\psi\)xe6

Black resigned.

SI 50.10

☐ Christensen

Nielsen

Correspondence game 1982

1.e4 c5 2.d4 cxd4 3.c3 dxc3 4.\(\Delta\)xc3 \(\Delta\)c6 5.\(\Delta\)f3 d6 6.\(\Delta\)c4 e6 7.0-0 \(\Delta\)e7 8.\(\Delta\)e2 a6 9.\(\Delta\)d1 \(\Delta\)c7 10 \(\Delta\)f4 \(\Delta\)f6

A nice example with 10...£c.57 is the game Kadar-Koszorus, Hungary 1979: 11.&xc.5 dxc5 12.£ac.1 Wa5 13.£b51 axb5 14.&xb5 42R5 15.£xc.5 f6 (after 15...£f6 is 16.£d41 is very strong) 15.b64 Wa7 of 16...\$Wb54 17.£c.4 Wa3 18.Wh5 g6 19.0xg6+ hxg6 20.wkb8, with a strong attack) 17.Wh5 g6 18.0xg6+ hxg6 19.Wk58 Wb5 20.&xe8+ dxc8 21.Wky84 x68 22.Wkg6+ dxc7 23.£c7+1 Wkc7 24.Wh7+, and Black resigned.

Black could also have castled kingside:

12.h3 0-0?!

But now White has a strong continuation based on the less solid position of the queen on b8. Black should have played 12...e5 or 12. \$\infty\$ for \$12.\$\infty\$ for \$12.\$\infty\$

13.e5! @e82!

13... ♠h5 is simply met by 14. ♠h2, but maybe Black should have gone for 13...dxe5!? 14 ♠xe5 ♠xe5 15. ♠xe5 ∰a7 after all

14.exd6 2xd6

14... \(\Omega \) xd6 looks quite dubious in view of the pin, but now White has a trick based on that very pin.

15.Exd6! @xd6 16.Ed1 e5

After 16... \$\bar{\pma}\$ the white player has indicated the following win: 17. \$\Delta e \text{0.8} \Delta \Delta \text{0.8} \Delta \text{

17.@xe5 @xc4 18.@a6



18...Ø 4e5?

Nowit will go downhill fast. Relatively better was 18...豐a7, although White is better after 19.允xf8 \$\phi\$xf8 \$\phi

An unnecessary move. White could have played 22.\(\textit{xg7!}\) at once.

22... wb8 23. e5 wa7?

With 23. We8 Black could still have made White's life quite difficult. It is true that White te can win back the exchange with 24.6c7, but the situation is no longer so clear-cut. From an aesthetic point of view, the slip-up on move 22 is regrettable.

24. £xg7!

The postman sometimes rings twice... Black is executed after all

24...⊈xg7

Or 24...\(\hat{L}\)xd5 25.\(\hat{L}\)d4. 25.\(\psi\)e5+ f6 26.\(\psi\)xe6 \(\psi\)ad8?!

Black's last resort was 26... \$\color{1}{\color{1}{2}}\color{1}{2}\color{1}\color{1}{2}\color{1}{2}\color{1}\color{1}\color{1}{2}\color{1}\color

plays 27.b4! 豐c6 28.♠f4!, and the endgame after 28... 費xe6 29.♠xe6+ 曼z8 30.♠xf8 星xf8 31.星d7 is very bad for Black.

27.Ec1! Ef7 28.Ec7!

Black resigned in view of 28... **a**f8 29. **a**e7! **b**8 30. **a**f5+ **a**g6 31. **a**e3, or 28... **a**xe7 29. **a**xf6+.

SI 50 10

☐ Conroy

■ Paredes

Correspondence game 1993

1.e4 c5 2.d4 cxd4 3.c3 dxc3 4.公xc3 公c6 5.公f3 d6 6.总c4 e6 7.0-0 公f6 8.豐e2 a6 9.基d1 豐c7 10.总f4 公d7?!

This is how Black prevents the advance e4-e5 from the game Belenko-Rivlin, but the text leaves the queenside pieces awkwardly placed. Besides, the king hangs around in the centre for far too long – with fatal consequences, as we will see.

11. Xac1 Wb8

After 11....âe7 the knight sacrifice 12. ②d5! is very strong, e.g. 12...exd5 13.exd5 ②ce5 14..âxe5 dxe5 15.d6, and White is winning. 12.b4!

Threatening 13.b5.

12.... € ce5

Black is in deep trouble. The game Limbos-Logie, correspondence 1987, saw 12...65? 13...d5! exd5 14...2xd5 &b7 15...5!, and Black resigned; after 15....€dxe5 l6...2x5 dxe5 17...2xc6 &xc6 18...2xe5 his position is in tatters.

12...⊙xb4? is not good either: 13.e5! d5 (or 13...dx5 14.⊙xe5 ∞xc5 15..oxc5 ∰a7 16.xb5+1 ⊙c5 17.⊙d51 axb5 18...⊙c7+ ∞r 19...oxf 4...ox 18...ox 18...ox 19...ox 19...o

13.≜.xe5! dxe5

13... ②xe5 is met by 14.②xe5 dxe5 15. **û**b5+! axb5 16.②xb5 **û**e7 17.②x7+ **☆**f8 18.④xa8 **饗**xa8 19.**愛**c4, winning.

14. @g5 @f6

The game Karlson-Khodos, Soviet Union 1958, saw 14...âc7, followed by 15.£xf7!
\$\psix\$17 16.\text{\(\text{\(Lambda\)}}\) (White blasts all the black king's defences off the board with sacrifices)

16... 如xe6 17. ₩c4+ 如f6 18. Id3 ②b6 19.直f3+ \$g5 20.對f7 息f8 21.h4+ \$h6 22. \$\mathbb{I}6+ g6 23. \$\mathbb{I}\$xb6, and White won.



15.9\b5!

And every time White can sacrifice a piece on

15...axb5

15... 2d7 White plays 16. 2xe6!, and wins, e.g. 16... \(\hat{a}\)xb5 17. \(\hat{a}\)xf7+ \(\phi\)e7 18. \(\psi\)d2 \(\infty\)xe4 19. 2xe4 axf7 20. ad5+

g6 19.₩f3 f5

All Black's moves are forced. 20.exf5 de7

Or 20...gxf5 21.\\hbar{w}h5+, or 20...exf5 21.\\hbar{w}d5. 21.Wb3 Wd6

Or 21... \$6 22. 2e4+ \$97 23. \$\text{\$\psi\$} xe6.

22. Id1 Ia3 23.f6+! 4xf6 Everything loses, including 23... \$\prix xf6\$ 24. @e4+ or 23... : e8 24. Exd6 Exb3 25. Exd7 **Bb1+26. Bd1** mate!

24. Exd6 Exb3 25. Exe6+ #d8 26.axb3 Black resigned. There were too many threats.

NICKEY Sicilian Defence

SI	1.e4 c5	Sicilian
SLI	2.@f3 d6 [3.@b5+]	Moscow
SI 2	2. £13 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4. ₩xd4	Hungarian
SI 3	2.⊕f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.⊕xd4 ⊕f6	
SI 4	5a6 6.2g5	Najdorf
SI 5	5a6 6.2g5 e6 7.f4 Wc7	Naidorf
SI 6	6e6 7.f4 €bd7	Najdorf
SI 7	6e6 7.f4 b5	Polugaevsky
SI 8	6e6 7.f4 ₩b6	Poisoned Pawn
SI 9	6e6 7.f4 &e7	Main Line
SI 10	5a6 6.&e2	Geller
SIII	5a6 6.@e2 e5 7.@b3 @e7	Geller
	5a6 6.f4	Najdorf
SI 12	5a6 6.\(\hat{a}.c4\)	Fischer
SI 14	5a6	Najdorf
31 17	540	
SI 15	5g6	Dragon
SI 16	5g6 6.@e3 [6@g7]	Dragon
SI 17	7.f3	Dragon
SI 18	7.f3 公c6 8.響d2 0-0 9.全c4	Dragon
SI 19	5e6	Scheveningen
SI 20		Keres
SI 21		Scheveningen
SI 22		Scheveningen
SI 23		Scheveningen
SI 24	7.0-0 響c7 8.f4 公c6	Scheveningen
CI 26	54266	Sozin
SI 25 SI 26	5©c6 6.&c4 e6	Velimirovic
SI 26	54.00 0.a.04 e0	*CHIIIIOVIC
SI 27	5@c6 6.@g5	Rauzer
SI 28	6e6 7.\d2 \@e7 8.0-0-0 0-0	Rauzer
SI 29	6e6 7.\div d2 a6	Rauzer

Rauzer

SI 31	2.ᡚf3 ᡚc6 3.Ձb5	Rossolimo
SI 32	2.@f3 @c6 [3.d4 cxd4 4.@xd4 e5]	De la Bourdonnais
SI 33	4g6	Accelerated Fianchetto
SI 34	4@f6 5.@c3 [5e6]	Four Knights
SI 35 SI 36 SI 37 SI 38	4 ᡚf6 5. ტc3 e5 6. ტdb5 d6 7. ჶg5 a6 8. ტa3 b5 9. Ձxf6 [9 gxf6 10. ტd5]	Lasker Pelikan/Bird Sveshnikov Sveshnikov
SI 39 SI 40 SI 41 SI 42	2.@f3 e6	Taimanov Taimanov Paulsen Paulsen
SI 43	2.@f3 [2a6; 2@f6]	Nimzowitsch
SI 44 SI 45	2.\pic3; 2.d3 2.\pic3 \pic6 3.g3 g6 4.\pig2 \pig7 5.d3 d6	Closed Sicilian Closed Sicilian
SI 46 SI 47	2.c3 2.c3 @f6 3.e5 @d5	Alapin Alapin
SI 48 SI 49 SI 50	2.b4; 2.b3; 2.@e2; 2.@c4 2.f4 2.d4	Wing Gambit Grand Prix Attack Morra Gambit

SI 30 6...e6 7. #d2 a6 8.0-0-0 ad7

Index of Players

A		Bosch	101	Döry	178
Adams	33, 52, 207	Boto	102	Drygalski	154
Afek	188	Botvinnik	46, 111	Dumitrache	193
Akopian	210	Bouwmeester	213	Dumitrescu	72
Al Modiahki	220	Brodsky	139	Dvoiris	34, 120
Alekhine	46	Brunner	18	Dvoretsky	201
Amann	172	Bryson	27		
Anand	82, 156, 221	Bukal	167		
Anderson	68	Bukhman	136	E	
Andersson	138	Buntic	102	Ehlvest	109
Andreeva	196	Burgess	226	Ekström	193
Ankerst	99			Engelhardt	161
Arakhamia	89			Enterfeldt	120
Arencibia	9	С		Ernst, Sipke	58
Arlandi	93	Chandler	167	Ernst, Thomas	55, 194
Aronin	211	Chavez	170	Estevez Morales	170
Arzumanian	187	Chekhov	165	Estremera	106
		Chiburdanidze	98, 196	Evans	59
		Christensen	228		
В		CITY Saratov	47		
Babula	140	CITY Stalingrad	47	F	
Bachtiar	46	Conroy	229	Fedorov	52
Baer	161	Costea	121	Feher	120
Balinov	95	Cramling	162, 168	Filutowski	154
Baljon	108	Cserna	31	Finkel	188, 199
Bangiev	26, 109	Csulits	149	Fiore	56
Barbero	126	Cvitan	84	Fischer	28, 107
Barczay	73	Czaya	14	Flesch	226
Barle	173, 190			Foigel	88
Baron Rodriguea		_		Frolov	176
Basanta	45	D		Ftaenik	41, 171, 224
Bauer	145	Daniliuk	48	Furman	183
Begun	163	David	52		
Belenko	227	De Firmian	86, 99	-	
Benjamin	96	De Vreugt	210	G	
Berczy	152	Dely	107	Gallo	103
Berzins	222	Dementiev	32	Gasseholm	121
Bezold	186	Di Palma	54	Gaviria	132
Bilek	46	Diepeveen	122	Gelfand	13, 36, 221
Bologan	199	Donner	44	Geller	115

	** **		20.22.	**	26
Georgiev, Krum	21, 81	Hodgson	70, 224 105	Kersten Kestler	126
Gerusel	145	Hoffer	44, 153	Kharitonov	100
Gik	60 79	Honfi Hracek	44, 153 62	Kharitonov	144
Gil Reguera		Hracek	62	Kirov Kletsel	91
Ginsburg	104			Kletsei	124
Gipslis	19	ī			207
Glek	94	-		Knezevic Korolev	207
Glienke	62	Inkiov	21		
Glushak	184	Isaev	203	Kortchnoi	19, 64
Gobet	67	Istratescu	63	Koskinen	219
Gofshtein	87	Ivanov, Igor	110	Kotronias	81
Golenev	49	Ivanov, Viktor	150	Kouatly	160, 218
Golubev	61, 147	Ivkov	158	Kozirev	162
Gongora	39			Kragelj	95
Gonzales	42			Kramnik	119, 139
Gorelikov	74	J		Krapivin	216
Gorelov	195	Jacobsen	226	Kuczynski	43
Gottlieb	77	Janosevic	146, 155	Kudrin	67
Grägger	44	Jansa	155	Kuijf	53
Grechikhin	17	Jaracz	222	Kummer	213
Grigorian	92	Jelen	142, 198	Kurajica	187
Grischuk	99, 164	Jenni	142	Kuzmin, Genna	
Groeneveld	54	Jeric	190	Kuznetsov	162
Grohde	50	Jhunjhnuwala	108		
Gross	101	Johnson	105	_	
Groszpeter	29			L	
Grottke	206			Lanc	141
Grund	189	K		Lanka	68, 104, 112
Gufeld	181	Kadar	226	Larsen, Pelle	176
		Kahn	223	Lasker	93
		Kalegin	34	Lassen	22
		Kalinichev	206	Lautier	133
H		Kallai	182	Lee	170
Haha	213	Kantarovich	211	Lokhanin	49
Hamann	158	Kapengut	136, 163	Luckans	112
Hamdouchi	220	Karadzic	153	Luther	26, 137
Handke	37	Karaklajic	202	Lutz	41, 140, 194
Hartston	144	Karlsson	22		
Hartung Nielsen	176	Karpov	60, 64		
Hector	146	Kasparov 11, 3	36, 73, 78, 133	M	
Helmers	171	Kelson	174	Madl	98
Hennings	149	Kempinski	38	Maeder	14
Hjartarson	91, 215	Kengis	157	Magomedov	203, 205
Hmadi	42	Keres	20	Malakhov	48

Shabalov	176, 204	Thorsteins	85	w	
Shakarov	109	Timman	13, 91	Wade	62
Shianovsky	181	Timoschenko	84	Wagman	173
	5, 96, 119, 164	Timotic	33	Wahls	30
Shishkov	76	Tirard	40	Walsh	172
Shmuter	80	Tisdall	170	Wang Zili	125
Sideif Zade	87	Tiviakov	55	Watson	43, 57
Sikirin	184	Tolnai	45. 51	Weber	131
Silman	174	Topalov	69	Wells	114
Simic	135	Troinov	111	Winslow	35
Sion Castro	134	Tsaturian	26, 130	Wohl	74
Skalik	38	Tsuboi	118	Woitkiewicz	87
Skripchenko	168	10000	****	Wu Wenjin	40
Smirin	68			Wydrowski	129
Smyslov	92	U		n yarawani	
Sobura	83	Ujhazi	179		
Sosonko	58, 66	Ulibin	144, 210		
Soto Perez	191	Unzicker	28	X	
Spangenberg	224	Cimionei	20	Xu Yuhua	162
Spaniaard	44			110 10000	
Spassky	126, 183, 215	V			
Spiridonov	174	Van de Mortel	58		
Spraggett	89	Van der Wiel	11, 139	Y	
Stein, Bernd	167	Van Tubergen	122	Ye Jiangchuan	82
Stein, Leonid	159	Van Wely	76, 206, 217	Yermolinsky	204
Steingrimsson	125	Varabiescu	105	Yilmaz	218
Stocek	166	Varadi	177	Yordanov	174
Stohl	18	Vasiukov	148, 206	Yudasin	10, 86
Stummeyer	130	Veingold	90	Yuferov	12
Sulipa	23	Vekshenkov	124		
Surtees	212	Velimirovic	135, 148		
Sveshnikov	149, 197	Vera	30		
		Veron	33	Z	
		Vitolinsh	12	Zajtsev	32
T		Vlassov	192	Zarnicki	113
Taimanov	143, 151	Vogt	180	Zettler	130
Tal	62, 116	Volchok	50	Ziatdinov	126
Taylor	68	Volkmann	186	Zuckerman	59
Temirbaev	115	Votava	194	Zuidema	158